

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVIII. No. 20  
WHOLE No. 462

FEBRUARY 23, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS  
\$3.00 A YEAR

## Chronicle

**The War.**—The week passed without major operations on any of the fronts. The German artillery vigorously shelled the French trench-works near Nieuport, on the coastal section of Flanders; also *Bulletin, Feb. 11, p.m.* near Juvincourt, on the bend of *Feb. 18, a.m.* the line near Reims, and in Champagne, in the region of Moronvilliers. Artillery duels were frequent east and west of the Meuse, on the Verdun front, and in the Vosges, in the sectors of Bonhomme and Voilu. In the Woevre the French raided the enemy trenches, capturing 250 prisoners, while in Champagne they gained a position in the German lines at Tahure, and inflicted some losses on the foe near the Butte du Mesnil. Field Marshal Haig reports minor but successful operations around Lens and west and south-southwest of Cambrai, as well as near the Houthulst Forest, northeast of Ypres. In their sector on the Lorraine front the Americans were exposed to gas attacks which were successfully repulsed. On the Italian front there was heavy artillery fighting in the eastern sector of the Asiago Plateau and in the area west of Monte Grappa. German attempts to seize positions east and west of the Frenzella Valley, as well as places recently won by the Italians on Monte di Val Bella and Col del Rosso, proved ineffective. An Austrian detachment which endeavored to rush the southern slopes of Sasso Rosso was beaten back. Rome also reports that there were encounters with enemy patrols in Villarsa and in the Ornic Valley. At Zenson a German party attempting to land on the right bank of the lower Piave was checked by heavy artillery fire, while east of Cortilazo, also on the lower Piave, the Italians captured stores of arms and ammunition. Berlin reports that after a day of lively artillery fire on the Sette Communi Plateau, the Austrians cleared the Italian positions, south of Sasso Rosso, and took about 180 prisoners. Eight British craft which were hunting submarines were sunk in the Straits of Dover by a raiding flotilla of enemy destroyers. After having sunk these vessels, seven of which were "drifters" and one a trawler, the enemy destroyers fled northward before they could be engaged. Shortly after a submarine shelled the town of Dover.

The war cabinet situation, overshadowed for a while

by other events, is not yet settled. The President and the Secretary of War seem for the moment to hold the advantage. Mr. Baker, to forestall

*Various Items* the threatened war-cabinet and ministry reorganized the general staff in

four divisions. He was upheld in the administration of his office against the attacks of Senator Weeks by Messrs. Glass and James. Meanwhile the President called a conference of Congressional leaders to show that he should be given the power asked in the Overman bill which would invest him with blanket authority over the war bureaus. The Overman bill, however, has been "toned down" and there seems to be some hope of a compromise which may be acceptable to all parties. The President ordered an investigation of the much-discussed Hog Island shipyard contracts to determine if there has been any criminal misuse of money in a project which estimated to cost \$21,000,000 has already cost twice that amount. The President's personal action settled the shipyard strikes in the East, which, in spite of the appeal to the laborers of Edward N. Hurley, Chairman of the Shipping Board, had, by the end of the week, assumed alarming proportions. The delay caused by the strike might easily be fatal to the successful prosecution of the war and might endanger the lives and the safety of our men at the front. There has been already talk of Government ownership of the yards and of a Federal conscription of the workers. The strikers stood for the principle of the "closed shop" and for a scale of wages similar to that of the men on the Pacific coast. A drastic war measure was adopted on February 15, when President Wilson issued proclamations making subject to control by license the entire foreign commerce of the United States. These proclamations give the Government control of imports and exports and commerce—with every nation of the world is affected. The imperative need for the release of ships to carry troops and munitions to France made the step necessary. It is estimated that 1,000,000 additional tons of shipping will be made available for military purposes. The President acted under powers given him by the Espionage and Trading with the Enemy acts. It is expected that trade with South America and the Orient will be largely affected. It is surmised

that some imports and exports not essential to the war may be reduced fifty per cent.

President Wilson, addressing Congress in joint session on February 11 replied to the recent peace-speeches of the German Chancellor, Count von Hertling, and the *The President An-Austrian Foreign Minister, Count swers Hertling and Czernin.* Chancellor von Hertling's *Czernin* statement, the President said, was very vague and confusing and led to no definite conclusion. It was very different from Count Czernin's, which the President described as very friendly in tone. Mr. Wilson repeated his former declaration that the United States had no desire to interfere in European affairs and "would disdain to take advantage of any internal weakness or disorder to impose her own will upon another people." He reiterated again that the United States would put forth its whole strength "in this war of emancipation." The test, he added, of whether it is possible for either Government to go any further in this comparison of views is simple and obvious. The principles to be applied are these:

That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent; that peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power; every territorial settlement involved in the war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival States; all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe and consequently of the world.

The President affirmed that a general peace upon such foundations can be discussed. "Until such a peace can be secured we have no choice but to go on." These general principles, the President added, have been accepted by every one except the military autocrats of Germany. In conclusion he warned the Central Powers that the vast resources of the United States would accomplish in the end what might be accomplished by peaceful negotiations.

On February 12 there were stirring debates and dramatic developments in the British House of Commons, including a challenge to the House by Lloyd

*The Lloyd George Speech* George, the Prime Minister, either to accept his policy or to turn the Gov-

ernment out, and a sharp exchange of rather heated words between the Prime Minister and the former Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, ending in an apology by Mr. George to Mr. Asquith. The most important feature of the debate was the Prime Minister's declaration that owing to their uncompromising attitude, he saw no hope of peace in the recent speeches of the German Chancellor, Count von Hertling and the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, Count Czernin. It was therefore the duty of Great Britain to continue her prepara-

tions to establish international justice by force of arms. The Government, the Prime Minister said, did not recede the least from its war aims as they had been stated. "The German Empire, or those who at present are in control of it," he exclaimed, "are not in the mood to discuss reasonable terms of peace with the Allies. I regret it profoundly, but there is no use crying peace when there is no peace." "Until there is some better proof," said the Minister, "than is contained in these speeches that the Central Powers are prepared to consider the war aims of the Allies, it must be the duty of Great Britain to make every effort to bring back international right in the world."

A few days after the debate in which the Prime Minister answered the Hertling-Czernin peace terms, it was officially announced that General Sir William Robertson, Chief of the British Imperial Staff, had resigned. General Sir Henry Wilson, Sub-Chief of Staff and British representative on the Versailles War Council, takes the place thus made vacant. General Robertson was unable to accept any appointment as military representative on the Versailles Council or to continue as Chief of Staff with limited power. The official announcement says:

The extension of the functions of the permanent military representative decided on by the Supreme War Council . . . has necessitated the limitation of the special powers hitherto exercised by the Chief of the General Imperial Staff. . . . In these circumstances the Government thought it right to offer General Sir William Robertson the choice of becoming the British military representative on the Supreme War Council at Versailles or continuing as Chief of the Imperial General Staff under new conditions. General Sir William Robertson, for reasons which will be explained . . . did not see his way to accept either position and the Government has with much regret accepted his resignation.

In an interview given to the London *Times*, General Robertson is reported to have stated that he did not resign, but that he would not accept either of the positions offered him.

Early in the week, dispatches from Amsterdam, later on confirmed by news from Berlin and Brest-Litovsk, announced that the President of the Russian delegation

*The German-Bolshevist Imbroglio* at the Brest-Litovsk peace conference had stated that while Russia desisted from signing a formal peace-treaty, it declared the state of war ended with Germany, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey, and that it had simultaneously given orders for complete demobilization of Russian forces on all fronts. The news at first caused enthusiasm in Germany, but gradually the enthusiasm gave way to doubts as to the permanence and the validity of a peace concluded under the circumstances which prevailed at Brest-Litovsk. The Berlin *Zeitung am Mittag* expressed the opinion that the old chaos would continue, and that therefore it would be necessary for Germany to continue to safeguard her frontier, both from a military and a diplomatic point of view. The *Nord-deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* said: "Trotzky is a sphinx,

who presents the world with a new riddle." By the end of the week, after Germany had signed her peace with the Ukrainians, against whom the Bolsheviks are now said to be moving troops, a change took place between Germany and the party with which she had just concluded a quasi-peace. Berlin dispatches to the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* said that the Central Powers did not intend to be robbed of the fruits of the lately concluded peace. The Cologne paper added that it had probably been decided at the Imperial Headquarters to resume operations on the Northern Russian front for the protection of the Ukraine. That Germany and Austria were still at war with Russia was the opinion of von Kühlmann, the German Foreign Secretary, at the concluding session of the Brest-Litovsk conference after Trotzky had made his final statement that Russia was out of the war and her armies would be demobilized, but that she would desist from signing a formal peace-treaty. The acts of war, Dr. von Kühlmann said, ended when the Russians and the Teutonic Allies signed the armistice some weeks ago, but when the armistice ended the warfare had to be revived. He added that the fact that one or two of the contracting parties had demobilized their armies would in nowise alter the situation. Later official dispatches stated that Germany had resumed war with Russia. Austria declared that her troops are not to be used on the Russian front without her formal consent. There have been riots, looting and murder in Petrograd.

A treaty of peace was formally signed at Brest-Litovsk between Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey, on the one hand, and the Ukrainian People's Repub-

**The Central Powers and the Ukraine** lic on the other. The more important articles of the treaty provide for

the cessation of hostilities between the contracting parties; for a determination of the frontier of the new republic whereby in the north she gets an increase of territory at the expense of Russia; for the immediate evacuation of her soil by the armies of the Central Powers; for the resumption of consular and diplomatic relations between the contracting parties immediately after the ratification of the peace-treaty. The Central Powers and the Ukraine renounce the reimbursement of their war costs and all indemnities for war damages; allow their respective war prisoners to return home, or with the approval of the State concerned to remain where they are or to proceed to another country. The Bolsheviks are threatening war on the new republic. The Ukraine has about 30,000,000 inhabitants and is the richest and the most fertile part of Russia. The value of its new ally to Germany may be estimated from the fact that the Ukraine supplies one-third of the whole Russian production of bread-corn, that it has 30,000,000 head of cattle, coal in superfluity, sugar, petroleum wells, quicksilver mines, iron mines and deposits of manganese.

**France.**—On February 15, Paul Bolo, known as Bolo Pasha, was condemned to death on the charge of treason.

The military court over which Colonel Voyer presided, returned a unanimous decision after fifteen minutes deliberation. Colonel

**Bolo Pasha**

Voyer pronounced the sentence of death. The following day Bolo filed an appeal from the decision of the court-martial. The sentence of death was likewise pronounced by default against Filippo Cavallinie, who is under arrest in Italy. Darius Porchère was sentenced to three years imprisonment, after a vote of six to one for conviction, on the lighter charge of commerce with the enemy.

The arrest of Bolo was due to information forwarded by the Government of the United States to the Government of France to the effect that more than 10,000,000 marks had been appropriated by the Government at Berlin to be used in disseminating pacifism in France, and that \$1,683,000 had been paid to Bolo by five different banks at the order of former Ambassador Count von Bernstorff. Bolo returned at once to France and immediately purchased a controlling interest in the Paris newspaper *Le Journal*. At the same time there appeared in French weeklies and dailies a number of articles directed to peace propaganda. The prosecution went on the assumption that Bolo was an active agent in the interests of Germany and was engaged in the effort to destroy the French morale by spreading the impression that it was impossible to beat Germany; its task was to show that the money received by Bolo was used by him either in whole or in part to depress the French people and induce them to come to terms with the enemy. Bolo denied that he had received money from the Germans. Cavallinie, who is an Italian subject, could not be extradited and will be tried in Italy.

**Ireland.**—Early this month the Rt. Rev. Dr. Fogarty, one of Ireland's most illustrious prelates, wrote the following letter about the war and conscription to Mr. J. K. Kett, of the County Clare Council:

*A Bishop on Conscription*  
I always knew that in writing as I did I was but giving expression, however inadequately, to what almost every man in Clare felt, and feels, on the subject at issue. Events have proved that Dr. Mannix was right. Australia has pronounced against conscription on an overwhelming vote. The disinterested Archbishop, and not the vainglorious Premier, was the true exponent of Australia's mind.

The whole thing is most instructive, and shows how nations and peoples may be, and often are, led against their will into false and horrible positions by a few ambitious muddlers, or schemers, at the head of the Government. Had they not a referendum in Australia, Mr. Hughes, with his Cabinet and Parliament, would have easily conscripted the country to death.

It is the same way with this horrid war itself. Were there a referendum to the people tomorrow in all the belligerent countries there is little doubt that it would result in an imperative demand for peace. Yet this accursed war is kept going, and the earth deluged daily in human blood and the biggest interests of mankind shoveled about like sand by a powerful but unscrupulous ring of politicians, profiteers, and pressmen.

Ireland is menaced with conscription, as was Australia, with

this difference, that Australia was a free country and could protect itself. Ireland is not free. But it is just as well that the *Morning Post* and the *Irish Times*, and the class they speak for, should clearly understand at once that any attempt to force conscription on this country will be attended with the most disastrous results.

At the annual meeting of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce, the President spoke these encouraging words about the Convention: "Quite recently rumors of a

*The Convention* rather exciting character were circulated through the city with regard to the breaking up of the Convention.

Personally, I do not see any reason why these rumors should have been circulated. I am very optimistic as to the result of the Convention. Little differences do arise from time to time, as is quite natural, but I have every hope that with moderation, a little common-sense and a little give-and-take from all parties, a solution, so far as the Convention is concerned, of the present unfortunate differences that do exist in Ireland will be found, and with good results to the country. I went to the Convention not representing any section or party; I went there for the purpose of doing as I thought best in the interests of Ireland, and I intend following out that resolution to the end."

This optimistic view is not shared by any large number of the Irish people, as is evidenced by this, among other facts, that Sinn Fein is still growing in popularity.

**Mexico.**—According to press dispatches under date of January 15, an agreement between the United States and Mexico is about to be consummated. Its terms include the following concessions by the United States to Carranza:

The United States Government agrees to advance Carranza 10,000,000 pesos gold or approximately \$5,000,000 to establish finances on a substantial basis. This 10,000,000 pesos gold will go to the so-called Bank of Emission or bank authorized to issue its own notes. The United States agrees to provide the gold before April 1.

The United States Government agrees to provide Mexico with 3,000,000 bushels of corn to tide over the corn famine until the new crop comes in.

The United States Government offers to provide Carranza with a quantity of rice.

The United States Government agrees to supply Mexico with farm implements and tractors, besides much needed agricultural machinery to enable cultivation of the plantations.

The United States Government agrees to supply boiler tubes and other necessary parts for rolling stock, etc., in order that the Mexican railroad system may be built up.

In return for these concessions Mexico agrees

To raise the embargo on the twenty-five per cent of silver exports which has hitherto been in force.

To provide sisal fiber at a cut price (later to be determined exactly) in order to supply the needs of the United States for grain bags, etc.

To make other stipulations regarding trade exports to the United States which are based on the prospect that virtually all Mexican trade for the present will go to the American people.

Two other problems appear to be left undecided,

namely, that Mexico be supplied with ammunition from the United States, and that, if Carranza permits American soldiers to cross the line into Mexico, in pursuit of bandits, our Administration should grant permission to Mexican soldiers to come into the United States, for a like purpose. Under date of February 16, Secretary Lansing denied that a loan of \$5,000,000 was to be granted Mexico; our Government, however, will permit gold to be exported to an "American banker in Mexico City." This, no doubt, is a reward to Carranza for his ardent pro-Germanism and anti-Americanism.

**Rome.**—In an interview given recently to Cardinal Dubois at the Vatican the Holy Father expressed his satisfaction at the reception which the chief points of

*The Holy Father* his own peace proposals had recently received in the speeches of President Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George. A

brochure just published by the *Bureau Documentaire Belge* explains the views of the Belgians on the independence which should be theirs after the war. These views are in complete accord with the formula proposed by the Holy Father last August and are a striking refutation of the statements of Baron Sonnino, who, it will be remembered, characterized the Pope's formula as inspired by the Germans. Meetings of considerable importance have been held in England for the purpose of organizing a united Catholic protest against the bullying of the Pope by his enemies all over the world.

The *Osservatore Romano* in a recent issue published a letter in which are given some of the details of the Pope's beneficent action especially in the Ottoman Empire. At the direction of the Holy Father, untiring efforts have been made by the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Dolci to assist those visited by the scourge of war, with no distinction of nationality or creed.

**Spain.**—Elections of Deputies, or representatives in the lower Chamber, will be held on February 24, and of Senators, or representatives of the Upper Chamber, on

*Elections* March 10. Every effort is being made by the Government to secure the utmost freedom and liberty in

voting, but the state of Spain is far from favorable for holding the elections. The country is still suffering from the recently attempted insurrection, and grave disturbances have occurred in many places as a result of the scarcity of food supplies and other necessities of life. The principal blame is placed on the selfishness of politicians who have persisted in subordinating the interests of the people to their own personal advantage. For these reasons it was thought that the dissolution of parliament and the new elections would be deferred, but the absence of anything like a serious crisis in the Government was apparently taken as an indication that the elections would be carried out in a spirit of fairness and without difficulty. On January 18 the new Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See was formally received by the Pope.

# The War Policy of the Pope

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS

**I**N my experience of many years with my countrymen I have always found them fair-minded and just. They have that decent regard for the opinion of others and that sense of tolerance and fair play which are rightly looked upon as the distinctive mark of a great democratic people. They willingly listen to both sides of a question and judge it on its merits. They are generous and sincere. In the trying times through which they are now passing and which are testing their mettle, they have given a noble example of fidelity to duty and of the spirit of self-sacrifice. Ready and armed in the cause of justice they are prepared for a long and cruel war and are willing to give their treasures and their lives to bring it to a successful end. But they would not prolong it one single moment beyond that term when it would become either useless or unjust. They are enlisted heart and soul for a just war. But they long intensely for a lasting and durable peace.

The world today is full of peace-terms and rumors of peace. When we consider the sorrows and the tragedies which the war has caused, and try to take measure of all the financial and industrial losses it has entailed both here and abroad, and look forward into the future in an endeavor to compute the misery and the ruin it will surely entail if prolonged, we cannot but yearn for the day when that just, honorable and durable peace is given to the world.

My heart goes out to all the sufferers of the war, to my own countrymen first of all, who, though alert and ready for every sacrifice in the cause of justice, are nevertheless suffering for no fault of their own, to the widows and the orphans it has left in its cruel passage, to the halt and the blind whom it has returned to their sorrowing homes. I mourn over the countless dead. But one lone and majestic figure calls for all my sympathy and love. More perhaps than any other single individual our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XV, has suffered in this tragedy. Others have but their own individual sorrows. He bears the sorrows of all. Wherever he turns his eyes from the Vatican he sees his children locked in deadly strife. He counts them by the thousands among our own countrymen who have generously answered their country's call, and among the Allies too, just as he does among the enemies whom they are facing on the field of battle. And though the triumph of justice always soles him, yet he cannot but mourn over the slaughter of his spiritual children.

It is not astonishing then that the Holy Father, lifted above the noise and the strife of world-policies has constantly and consistently worked for a just and enduring

peace. Reasonable men expect that from him. He is a priest. To millions of Catholics throughout the world he is the Supreme Pontiff commissioned by Christ to rule and guide His flock. Like his Master he rules not by the sword, but by love. He is the universal Pastor. As such he cannot become a participant in the strife. And though he should condemn and has actually condemned all violations of the laws of war, yet as far as is consistent with morality and religion, he must hold the balance of an equal judgment between the contending parties. Those who wish that he had done more, misunderstand the nature of his office. He is not an ordinary neutral. His position has peculiar features that make it altogether unique. He is a co-sufferer with all the nations in the conflict. Except in rare cases where it was his duty to act, he was bound to look upon all alike, and by counsel and warning endeavor to bring the combatants to a mutual understanding, and in this he has not been entirely unsuccessful.

It must not be thought that his silence, when he thought it necessary, came from cowardice, worldly prudence or political and selfish motives. From the first letter which the Holy Father addressed to the world on September 8, two days after he had been crowned, in which he expressed his horror at the awful catastrophe into which the war had plunged the nations, down to the eloquent protest of a few weeks since, in which he solemnly condemned the useless and cruel air-raids on the beautiful city of Padua, as contrary to the law of nations, he has not been afraid to speak out in favor of peace and against cruelty. Two months after his election, in his Encyclical "*Ad Beatissimi*," he made an earnest appeal to the nations to put an end to the war. He spent the following weeks of that year in a generous and truly Christian endeavor, unfortunately not crowned with success, to obtain a cessation of hostilities during those hallowed days when the world celebrated the coming of the Prince of Peace.

Scarcely a month of his Pontificate passed without some word of warning from him, some appeal for the prisoner, the war sufferer, some protest against the horrors and injustices of the fratricidal struggle. On January 22, 1915, he again earnestly pleaded for the cessation of armed strife. He appointed February 7 for Europe and March 21 for the rest of the world as a day of public prayer for peace, by the millions of his children throughout the world. In the month of May of that same year he asked his subjects, wherever found, to turn to the Immaculate Heart of the Mother of God and to pray to her that order, peace and love might soon be

restored to a suffering world. Towards the end of that year, in the Consistorial Allocution of December 6, he made one of his memorable statements, one that may be considered as the seed of every legitimate movement for peace undertaken since, when he declared that a way to a just and durable peace consisted in a clear and straightforward formulation by the respective parties of their aims and purposes, to be followed by a conference in which, all injustice being laid aside, mutual concessions and compensations should be made in the spirit of equity. In 1916 he urged the practice of the spirit of penance in the families of the belligerents and appointed a general Communion day for the children, for the return of peace. A few months later he protested against the malicious charges made against his impartiality and solemnly affirmed that no selfish interest guided his acts, but that he was working for the cause of suffering and bleeding humanity. The following year witnessed again his untiring efforts in the cause of order and civilization. His work culminated in his peace note of August 1 to the heads of the many nations at war, a document which, in spite of its critics, is a monument to the universal affection, the prudent diplomacy and the strict impartiality of the Vicar of Christ. That document has been misunderstood by some, by others wilfully misinterpreted. It was not meant to be a final award. It purported to be but an effort to bring the nations together, in the persons of their representatives and delegates for the purpose of beginning a discussion of peace. It was not a judicial decision. It was a diplomatic effort. It contained the broad outlines of a plan of settlement. Unless I am much mistaken, when the peace congress assembles the final verdict of the nations will be based on the general principles pointed out by the Holy Father.

It has been said again and again that Benedict XV has forgotten Belgium, that he did not speak up for her in her hour of betrayal by the superior forces of her invaders. When Benedict XV came to the throne, Belgium had already been invaded by the German armies and a considerable part of her territory overrun. The flagrant injustice had already been committed. When the invasion took place the saintly Pius was already in the shadow of death. On coming to the throne the new Pope did not wait long to let the world know of his sentiments with regard to the violation of Belgian territory. He spoke at first with prudent circumspection, for not all the facts were in his possession. But he soon learned the truth and acted conformably to it. According to the letter written by the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, to M. Van der Heuvel, Belgian Minister to the Vatican, "The violation of the neutrality of Belgium, carried out by Germany, on the admission of her own Chancellor, contrary to international law, was one of those injustices which the Holy Father in his Consistorial Allocution of January 22 strongly reprobated." And the Hamburger *Fremdenblatt* (January 29, 1917),

in allusion to this, complains that "The one belligerent power against which the Vatican has spoken is Germany." Writing to M. Laudet, editor of the *Revue Hebdomadaire*, in July, 1915, the Pope also protested against "the martyrdom of the poor Belgian priests and so many other horrors on which light has been cast." He protested also against the Belgian deportations and had hundreds of victims of these cruel measures returned to their homes. Such has been his solicitude for the martyred nation that it has called for the most profuse thanks from the two great heroes of the war, King Albert and Cardinal Mercier. His Holiness also protested to Russia against the violence to persons and to conscience displayed during the early occupation of East Prussia and Galicia, and against the harsh treatment of Mgr. Szeptycki, the venerable Archbishop of Lemberg. He has labored for the prisoners of war, for the crippled and the blind of the war's countless battlefields. Not once has he forgotten that he is the Father of the Faithful. His conduct towards the Italian Government has been marked by such a spirit of conciliation, justice and absolute impartiality that high government officials have praised him and those under his jurisdiction. The silly and cowardly slanders recently brought against his patriotism by radicals are so gross as not to deserve a refutation.

The Holy Father has faced a terrible ordeal. He is facing it still. On all sides he is surrounded by pitfalls. Every act of his is watched, scrutinized by jealous, critical, hostile eyes, only too ready to find fault and to register blame. More than ever he needs the support of his loyal children. The Roman Pontiffs of the past have ever found in American Catholics a whole-hearted devotion. We are not going to fail our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XV, in this supreme hour. For all that he has done so nobly and so unselfishly for the cause of peace and humanity his faithful children here in the United States, for whose people he has more than once expressed his admiration and love, are profoundly grateful. Though at war in order that all the peoples of the earth may be really free, we wish with him that a just peace may be soon regained. For that peace he has nobly and generously striven. Men may not now realize the extent and the nobility of his efforts, but when the voices of passion are stilled, history will finally do him full justice.

As a last word I beg to congratulate my countrymen on the generous ardor with which they have rallied to the support of our beloved President in his dark hour of trial. He has striven for high ideals and has found a reward in an enthusiastic response from his fellow-citizens. They have not failed him and will not do so in the future but will continue to give him and his ~~colleagues~~ that loyal support which is an earnest of complete victory and of a return of the happy peace for which he and the Holy Father are earnestly laboring, each in his own sphere.

# Rise and Fall of Protestant Prosperity

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

HERE was a time when much was said and written of the material prosperity of so-called Protestant countries. The voices that then were heard have died into silence or are but feebly audible now. As an argument against the Catholic Church this vaunt of prosperity was never to be taken seriously. Yet we can readily understand its power of appeal to the masses, since even the Apostles were misled by such tests and standards of religious truth before their minds had been more fully enlightened by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. "Blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in me," was the warning of Our Lord.

Christ had not come to restore to the Jewish nation the vanished glory of Solomon, the golden splendors of the ancient temple, the porch of pillars and the house of precious stones. His disciples were to be driven from city to city, and men were to glory in afflicting them as if performing a service to God. Christ Himself was to be, in the eyes of the world, the most monumental failure of all. Only when He was lifted up upon the Cross was He to draw all things to Himself.

Yet from the teachings of His Church there was to spring, as the flower from its seed, the most perfect material civilization the world had seen. The paintings of Raphael, the sculptures of Michael Angelo, the poems of Dante, and those majestic cathedrals whose beauty and value the modern world has just learned to appreciate are eloquent expressions of her great ideals. Wherever the Catholic Church advanced there likewise sprang up thousands of nameless builders who wrought into monuments of stone the inspirations of their faith. There, too, were to be found in every city and town those splendid co-operative associations, the Catholic gilds, which in the period of their perfection expressed the truest ideals of human brotherhood and the highest principles of economic justice and Christian charity to which the world has yet attained.

But time came when the statues in her sanctuaries were smitten to earth by the destructive mallet of the Reformer; when her libraries of classic and patristic lore were pillaged and her archives scattered to the winds; when her gilds were ruthlessly stripped of their accumulated wealth devoted to charity and the service of God; when her richly illuminated missals, bright with gold and all the living colors borrowed from earth and sky, were cast upon the blazing pyre; when her storied windows, all aglow with scenes from Holy Writ and the lives of saintly men and women, were broken into thousands of fragments; and the matchless music of her Solemn Masses, that rolled in mighty harmonies through the high cathedral vaults, was silenced by relentless edicts.

The creed of sixteen centuries of Christianity, the perfect and complete expression of the Gospel teaching, which alone had given being to all this mighty art, had suddenly become a pernicious superstition in the eyes of men whose own lives bore no imprint of the sanctity of Apostolic times. Enter today the doors of the world's greatest museums and view the wonderful collections of painting, sculpture, architecture and the marvelous works of the loom, and you will find yourself standing in bewilderment before the mere fragments and remnants of Catholic art.

Yet when this had been swept away, so far as the hand of man could complete its ravages, and the desolated fanes had been newly dedicated to a worship which their builders would have abhorred no less than the Egyptian idolatry, a new culture arose. It began in Germany and soon took even more exclusive possession in more northern lands, while Catholicism, which nowhere could be completely destroyed, retained unbroken hold in the more sunny countries of Italy, France and Spain. Yet even into these lands the new culture spread, in spite of their ancient and Apostolic Faith.

Upon that new culture is based the Protestant prosperity of which the world was for a time to hear so much, and which today is weighed in the balance and found wanting by the universal consent of mankind. Sociologists, economists, labor unionists, Catholics, Protestants, Jews are all in accord upon this one fact: that the new civilization, as it gradually developed since the days of the Reformation and reached its complete expression in the years immediately preceding the great world-war, was a dismal failure and a sad mistake. There can be no disagreement on this, however the minds of men may vary in their proposed plans of social and economic reconstruction.

That the material prosperity from which the world has turned in protest today is essentially the result of the Reformation, no one can doubt who has wisely studied the economic history of the past four centuries. Such it has always been proclaimed by Protestants themselves. Careful reflection will show that it is based upon strictly Protestant principles, not in so far as these principles are Christian, but in so far as they are Protestant, that is in opposition to Catholic doctrine. It is important that this great truth be thoroughly grasped in order that the new reconstruction may be based upon more sound and lasting foundations. There is supreme need for Protestant and Catholic alike to find the reason for the failure of the past and to base the new social structure four-square upon the unchangeable and indestructible rock of Christian principles.

It is true that the new Protestant culture brought a certain type of prosperity. It is true likewise that this prosperity reached its culmination before the world-war. But it is equally true that it differed in an essential way from that Catholic ideal of true prosperity which the world is seeking again today, though it is still blindly groping in the darkness after Socialist delusions and deceptive dreams. It rests with the Church to show the path to real Christian Democracy.

Protestant prosperity was first a civic and later a national prosperity. It reached its highest development in modern Germany and England. In its nature it was never identical with the common good, as true prosperity must always be. The latter provides for the real good of all; the former for the inordinate enrichment of a few. Upon this excessive opulence of the wealthy classes the claim of the false prosperity was founded. It is a commonplace of history that the greatest oppression and impoverishment of the masses can coexist with the highest external splendor, wealth and material culture of a nation. Such were the conditions in Rome and Greece in the day of their decadence. Such was the splendor of ancient Egypt, of Babylon and Nineveh. More significant than men commonly understood was that question asked in one of our prominent secular magazines: "Is America riding to a Roman fall?" The same question could have been asked as well of England and of Germany, or of other countries which had all in a greater or less degree adopted false economic standards.

Strange, therefore, though it may still appear to some, the peculiar nature of the new prosperity was not directly due to the invention of machinery but to the newly invented doctrines of the Reformation. Such statements are not made in the carping spirit of criticism, but are based upon evidence. The new teaching rejected the Scriptural truth that Christ established His Church not merely for the administration of His Sacraments, but likewise to keep His doctrine pure and undefiled to the end of time. He had for this purpose promised her freedom from error by the assurance of His abiding presence. All this the Reformation ignored. The Church was no longer regarded as the official interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures, though these Scriptures themselves warn us that men, left to their personal interpretation, may wrest them to their own perdition. Each one might read out of the Bible or into it his own favorite prejudices. This false individualism in religion soon had its parallel in the false economic individualism on which the Protestant prosperity was founded.

In all social and economic relations the Church demands that the common good be first and always kept in view. All private privilege must yield to it. But with the new doctrine a new ethical code arose. Each one sought, under the new individualism of the Reformation, to enrich himself to the utmost without regard for the common good of his fellow-men. In Catholic times this tendency of fallen nature would likewise have striven

to exert itself, but against it there would have stood forever the teaching of the Church. Under the new individualism the duty of State interference and regulation was furthermore ignored, since the State too interpreted the Bible after its own prejudices. This meant a slavish compliance with the desires of the rich and powerful who asked for nothing more than an absolute freedom of individual bargaining with labor. The latter was thus stripped of all its power of collective action which the Church so jealousy safeguards. As a consequence enormous individual fortunes soon grew up side by side with the most abject impoverishment and oppression of the masses.

Though labor, after centuries of struggle against these false principles, regained many of its rights, yet discontent and dissatisfaction grew. Men could but ill conceal their disquiet at the intermittent volcanic rumblings that waxed constantly more ominous beneath the bright surface of the new social and economic prosperity for which Protestantism was so eager to take the full credit.

In vain did Catholic leaders like Bishop Ketteler in Germany, Cardinal Manning in England and the great Pope Leo XIII point out the deception underlying this Dea-Sea fruit. In words never to be forgotten the Pontiff thus described both the history and nature of the false prosperity at a moment when it was approaching its very zenith and was receiving the adulation of its worshipers:

The ancient workmen's gilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organizations took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that working-men have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different form but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious men. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.—("The Condition of Labor.")

Such is the true picture of the misery that lay hidden beneath a mere public or national prosperity. Since that time conditions have changed considerably in many regards. Labor has asserted itself and is fast gaining strength. The future fate of the nations is likely to turn upon the question whether labor will use its power prudently, justly and religiously. A new era is dawning, a great world-crisis to which the struggle of warring nations is only a prelude. There are glorious prospects for the world today if it will heed the voice of the Church: "Not in Socialism," she cries in accents of earnest warning, "not in capitalism as based on the Reformation, but in Christian co-operation lies the hope of the future!" Only through a return to her can this hope ever be fully realized.

## The Convert in the Church

CHARLES PHILLIPS

"I HAVE been in perfect peace and contentment. I have never had one doubt," wrote Cardinal Newman, when speaking of his state of mind from the hour that his conversion to the Faith was consummated; and there is not in the world today a convert who, enjoying the graces of God's Church and the Sacraments, will not echo his declaration. But Newman was speaking of spiritual peace and contentment. He was not always made happy, however, externally happy, sensibly happy, by reason of the great change he had undergone. On the contrary, he was often made very unhappy, and not alone by the Charles Kingsleys of his day, seeking to impeach his sincerity, but by fellow-members of the very fold into which he had come expecting, naturally, a welcome. And in that experience, as well as in his achievement of "perfect peace and contentment" of soul, how many and many a follower in his footsteps has shared, with heartburning and tears and much bewilderment!

"The convert!" How lightly is that little word spoken, as though signifying merely a passage from one church to another! But how much it stands for!" Percy Fitzgerald, himself a convert to the Catholic Faith, once said,

For what agonizing wrestlings and tortures of mind, unseen and unknown! What rendings and bendings of the conscience! What struggles and calls resisted and finally obeyed! What tearings of the heart-strings! How awful the almost cruel disregard of family ties and interests, the light and truth having often to be purchased at the sacrifice of all that is dearest in the world.

There is an ever-increasing army of souls in this country brought to a deep appreciation of those words, which so well describe their own trying experiences; for yearly the number of converts increases amongst us. That is an old story now. A few years ago a conversion was rare, an event novel in its infrequency. Today, in every city in the land, numbers upon numbers of men and women, young and old, are entering the Church annually. Missions are being given from one end of the country to the other: the sun never sets on the missionary Cross. The tireless machinery of the Apostolic Missionary Union, with its diocesan bands scattered all over the United States; the systematic preaching to non-Catholics carried on year in and year out, by the Jesuits, the Paulists, the Dominicans, by all of the preaching Orders: all these are beginning to garner a heavy harvest over the land, a harvest that increases and waxes richer every year and every day. The figures now run into the thousands annually.

And what of these converts? Do born Catholics appreciate their relation to them, or the trials they undergo? Percy Fitzgerald's words are the simple truth: there are ten thousand souls to verify them with their own bitter scars of loneliness and misunderstanding,

loneliness among their new-chosen brothers, loneliness away from their old-time friends, now cut away from them; and misunderstanding on both sides. Monsignor Benson, the foremost English convert of the last decade, put the plea for his fellow-newcomers into the Church in memorable words:

I do entreat Catholics to have special consideration for converts. Do not make them feel more clumsy and awkward and less at home. I ask you to remember that converts have often much to suffer, and that the Church was built upon a convert, and one who was not perfectly satisfactory, St. Peter himself having in one dark hour fallen away. Remember the number of saints who have been converts, and do not despise the converts of your own acquaintance and treat them as if they were half-baked Catholics. The phrase "Catholics and converts" is one that never ought to be used.

The Catholic, newly received into the Church, and inevitably sensitive, is bound to ask himself, if not others, "Am I not just as much of a Catholic as they are?" Yet there are many of us who have seen converts treated in such a way by those born in the Faith as to shrink from contact with the latter, so trying is their position made. Sometimes they are frankly looked upon as mere curiosities; or again as faddists who have blown in with a batch of new ideas with which to refresh the old leaven, and the manner in which "born" Catholics, with some pet grievance against priest or Pope, will flock to them to unburden their disgruntled hearts is not edifying, to say the least. Sometimes it is enough to shake the new-built faith of the newcomer. And it is not alone the layman who can make the convert uncomfortable! Converts who are priests can tell their own stories of the treatment they have received from brother-priests; and there are converts among the laity, too, who could unfold a tale of embarrassment and discouragement suffered at the hands of suspicious and uncomprehending shepherds of the flock. The fear that rules the hearts of some of us that the convert may get his head turned if he receives too warm a welcome to our household often seems to drive worthy souls to an extreme of rigidity that is frost-biting in its effect. "Put yourself in his place!" What a rule of life that is! In Monsignor Benson's words:

Before you criticize converts make perfectly sure that if God had called upon you to do what many of them have to do, you would have done it. I don't think, making all due allowances, that it is really because of any uncharitableness on the part of old Catholics that this criticism becomes necessary; and probably you do not say those little things that might hurt them. But on the other hand, be sympathetic, and you will find a ready response.

"Old" Catholics, as Monsignor Benson called them, have a double relationship to the convert: they have the responsibility of helping him; and they have the duty of learning from him. There was never a newcomer into the Church yet who did not need and desire "the touch of a friendly hand" to make the so-new and so-strange ways of his Father's Mansion easy and familiar for him; and there never was a convert yet, the new-born vigor of whose faith, whose joy in possessing the truth, whose

aspirations and ideals, could not quicken and enliven the religious life of those who have had the good fortune to enjoy the Church's graces and benefits all their days.

Some foolhardy critic once had the temerity to call Monsignor Benson a "turncoat." "I deem it no disgrace," responded the Monsignor, "to turn my coat be-

cause I had it on inside out." Catholics who have the right spirit will not make the newcomer uncomfortable by pointing out with the finger of curiosity, or the finger of imagined superiority, the fact that sometimes the convert's coat hangs a little strangely at first, or doesn't seem to be exactly a tailor-cut fit.

## An Issue Between Science and Faith

ALFRED RAHILLY, M.A., B.Sc.

**I**N spite of the numerous and excellent treatises on apologetics now accessible, it is not always easy to grasp the precise issue between science and faith; the essential becomes obscured in the multiplicity of detail. A schematic illustration may therefore help us to appreciate the problem. Suppose that there are two men, one of whom, A, sees, or claims to see, an object which B emphatically declares he cannot see. In the discussion which arises, A maintains that, as far as concerns this particular class of objects, B is blind; whereas B roundly denies that there is anything at all to be seen. As a literal fact, this is the impasse to which the discussion of Blondlot's famous N-rays led; but I instance it here merely as typical of the conclusion to many a religious controversy. The question is: Can we get beyond this barren contradiction? Could not B, for instance, maintain that the laws of vision which A upholds are self-contradictory or at least have no possible analogy with the ordinary visual laws acknowledged by both? And A might retort that the admitted deficiencies in B's vision render further lacunae probable, and that B ought to improve his vision either by practice or with extraneous optical aid.

This latter stage of the controversy seems more promising and it is here that the analogy will be helpful. B, the man of science, maintains that his vision represents the triumph of pure reason and that the vision of faith claimed by A is the outcome of some mystical process which is essentially irrational or at least non-rational. Now what can A answer in defense of faith? He can deny that there is any such absolute distinction between the methods of science and faith; he can show that faith is the higher analogue of science and equally rational in its workings.

In what sense, then, is science rational? In the same sense as man is rational, as an ideal rather than an actuality. Reason is but a single factor in us, often weak and dormant, requiring extraneous help and appeals to sense-intuition. This is not stated in order to decry reason, but only to urge that the process by which we reason, the faculty wherewith we see reasoning, is conditioned and finite in every one of us. There are, no doubt, great differences of degree, but none of kind. None of us is rational in the sense that he can apprehend

argument apart from sense-impressions and independent of acquired mental habits. Pure reason carries us only a very short way; if the modern student progresses rapidly, it is simply because he can climb on the shoulders of a Euclid or a Newton. Every professor knows how indispensable are appeals to intuition and experiment to aid the reasoning even of advanced students, how strenuous a resistance preconceptions make to the entrance of fresh ideas, how slowly and painfully is room made for new facts and new theories. The reasoning may be faultless, but nevertheless without careful psychological preparation the pupil will not apperceive it, he will not "take it in." And it is important to notice that the historical development of science is parallel to its growth in the individual mind. In each generation, of course, the men of science regard themselves as the embodiment of pure rationality, but to the next generation they appear encrusted with the limitations and prejudices of ordinary humanity. So too the individual student, "scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend," is at each stage oppressed with a sense of finality and cocksureness, which is dissipated only if he makes further progress.

In this matter of scientific truth it is important for us to acquire historical perspective and to rise above the dogmatism of the current text-book. To do this it is not necessary to revert to Thales or Aristotle; a few modern instances will suffice. It was in the heyday of the enlightenment (1790) that the Paris Academy received with ridicule and incredulity a report submitted by the municipality of Juillac in Gascony, wherein more than 300 signatories testified to a fall of stones; contemporary science had no room for meteorites. It was through the opposition of Laplace, the very ideal of frigid mathematical logic, that Fresnel's researches on light-diffraction were long delayed, mislaid and even lost. The now famous memoirs of Mohr, Mayer and Helmholtz were refused publication in the best scientific periodicals of their time; Ruskin's "Unto This Last" met a like fate at the hands of the economists. Even in mathematics we meet the same reluctance or inability to admit new ideas; the influence of Newton for centuries retarded mathematics in Cambridge; the first edition of Grassmann's "Ausdehnungslehre" (1844) was sold as waste

paper and Grassmann took to philology and translated the "Rig Veda." To come nearer our own day, the biological researches of Mendel and Gibbs's great memoirs on energetics were for a whole generation ignored. And to show that contemporary science is no exception I might instance the opposition of Kelvin to the newer ideas on radioactivity, the horror which some chemists feel even yet for ions and electrons, the repugnance to the theory of *quanta* still shown by adherents of the classical mechanics, the scientific boycott—the word is not too strong—which still exists among Darwinians and Monists against the facts and proofs of Mendelism and vitalism, the scornful rejection, on the part of older psychologists like Wundt and Titchener, of the newer methods inaugurated at Würzburg and Louvain.

In the face of all this how can we set science apart from the other cognitive efforts of the human mind or invest its conclusions with unique certitude? The perception of any type of truth is psychologically mediated, it is dependent on the development of a corresponding faculty or habit, it is therefore subject to inevitable limitations. This principle, as I have shown, applies not only to faith but to science itself. Faith, indeed, presupposes a more searching preparation of soul and demands a deeper experience; but it is not the less rational on this account, rather the contrary. Anyone can grasp the elementary truths of mathematics or physics, whereas ethical appreciations normally require cleanliness of life: nothing so prejudices our moral judgments as an immoral life. Are we therefore to conclude that ethics is less stable or less true than physics? We ought rather to deduce that the higher and more complex is the domain of truth or beauty, the greater preparation and the more complete faculty do we require for its perception.

To the man of science, then, I would say: the pedagogy of faith is but the higher analogue of the teaching of science. You cannot have science unless you first create the scientific mind; so you cannot have faith without first having the faith-mind. Blessed are the clean of heart for they shall see God. You rightly object to a theologian discoursing on science without having had a scientific training; but you are wrong in assuming that faith is at the beck and call of everyone, that a classical scholar or an archeologist or biologist can without further ado reject the light of faith. What if faith be beyond their competence as science is beyond the layman and moral ideals beyond the depraved? Perchance they lack the light because they lack the vision? For the vision of God's Kingdom is promised not to scientific experts, not to philological specialists, but to little children. It is quite true that the man of faith cannot understand science unless he become a specialist; it is equally true that the man of science cannot enter into the kingdom of God unless he become a little child. It sounds very crude and old-fashioned in this great twentieth century; nevertheless it is the teaching of Christ.

## Catholic Chaplains in the Mexican War

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

WHEN the war with Mexico, resulting from the annexation of Texas, began there were, as there have been in all the wars in which the United States have been engaged, many Catholic soldiers in the army that took the field. At that time the law did not provide for the appointment of chaplains, and much indignation was rife throughout Catholic circles over the punishment inflicted by fanatical military chiefs on Catholic soldiers who had refused to attend Protestant services sanctioned by regimental officials. This trouble greatly annoyed President Polk, Secretary of State Buchanan, Secretary of War Marcy and other civil officers. By request Bishops Hughes of New York, Portier of Mobile and Kenrick of St. Louis, who were in Baltimore in attendance at the Sixth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy, went to Washington, on May 20, 1846, and called at the White House where President Polk consulted them about the appointment of Catholic chaplains for the army. He expressed a great wish to have such appointments made and asked the Bishops to give him the names of two priests to whom commissions would at once be issued.

After a very pleasant interview with the President the Bishops retired to Georgetown College and decided that two Fathers of the Society of Jesus should be selected. On consultation with Father Verhaegen, the Visitor of the Society, Father John McElroy, then pastor of Trinity Church, Washington, and Father Anthony Rey, the Minister at the College and Secretary to the Provincial, were designated for the chaplaincies. Their names were sent at once to President Polk, who directed that they be appointed chaplains for the Catholic soldiers. What happened after this is told by Father McElroy in a reminiscence he contributed to the *Woodstock Letters* (Vol. XV, 1886):

In a few days, says Father McElroy, the two Fathers called on the Secretary of War for instructions how to proceed. He (Mr. Marcy) received us very affably, expressed his desire that we should visit the President, and ordered his chief clerk to prepare letters for the Commanders of different posts to facilitate our journey; besides he requested me to give him my views of what he should expect while with the Army, which I sent him a little later in writing and which he embodied, almost transcribed, in his despatch to General Taylor. The Secretary introduced us to the President who received us with great kindness and regard, he expressed a hope that our mission would be one of peace; that we carried not the sword, but the olive branch, that our mission would be a refutation of the erroneous opinions held in Mexico, that the United States warred against their religion, etc. He continued to state very frankly the great desire he had to bring their matters of dispute to an amicable conclusion.

As neither of us could speak Spanish I proposed to the President the propriety of associating with us a third clergyman who was familiar with the language. He very promptly adopted my suggestion and told the Secretary to embody that in his despatch to the General-in-Chief, where it will be found.

In a subsequent interview the Secretary of War asked us what we thought sufficient for our expenses. I replied that I was ignorant of it, not knowing the country, our manner of living, etc. He observed that when the law authorized chaplains their pay was from \$1,000 to \$1,200. I told him that this would appear to be sufficient, he inserted in his despatch the larger amount. Although there is no law of Congress authorizing the appointment of chaplains for the Army the President in our case made out our commissions by virtue of his discretionary power, besides the pay of \$100 a month, our traveling expenses to and from the seat of war were to be defrayed. An advance to each of three months' pay was made and \$100 each for traveling, making in all \$800. This sum we received at the Quartermaster's office in gold on June 1, 1846.

The letter of the Secretary of War to Father McElroy states the views of the President precisely and was as follows:

War Department, May 21, 1846.

Sir:

The President is desirous to engage two Reverend gentlemen of the Roman Catholic Church to attend the army of occupation now on the Rio Grande to officiate as chaplains, etc. In his opinion their services would be important in many respects to the public interest, particularly in the present condition of our affairs with Mexico. Having sought information as to the proper persons to be thus employed, his attention has been directed to you, and he has instructed me to address you on the subject in the hope that you may consider it not incompatible with your clerical duties or your personal feelings to yield to his request.

It is proper that I should apprise you that the existing laws do not authorize the President to appoint and commission chaplains, but he has authority to employ persons to perform such duties as appertain to chaplains. Should you consent, as the President hopes you will, to visit the Army and remain some time with it you will be allowed a reasonable compensation for expenses and services. Your views of what that ought to be you will, if you please, suggest to me.

When the law authorized the appointment of chaplains as it formerly did, the pay and emoluments were about \$1,000 or \$1,200 per annum. This amount would be readily allowed together with the expenses of traveling to and from the Army.

I should be pleased to be favored with a reply to this communication at your earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,  
W. L. MARCY,  
Secretary of War.

To the Reverend  
John McElroy,  
Georgetown College.

A similar letter was sent to Father Rey and both communications, as will be seen, were written the day after the visit of the Bishops to President Polk. The instructions given to General Taylor by Secretary Marcy in regard to the standing, pay and expenses of the two chaplains are to be found in the following letters:

(Confidential)

War Department, Washington, May 29, 1846.

Sir,

The President has been informed that much pains have been taken to alarm the religious prejudices of the Mexicans against the United States. He deems it important that their misapprehensions in this respect should be corrected as far as it can be done, and for that purpose has invited the Reverend gentlemen who will hand you this communication, Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey of the Roman Catholic Church to attend to the army under your command and to officiate as chaplains. Although the President cannot appoint them as chaplains yet it is his wish that they be received in that character by you and your officers, be respected as such and be treated with kindness and courtesy, that they should be permitted to have intercourse with the soldiers of the Catholic Faith, to administer to their religious instruction, to perform divine service for such as may wish to attend whenever it can be done without interfering with their military duties, and to have free access to the sick or wounded in hospitals or elsewhere.

It is confidently believed that these gentlemen in their clerical capacity will be useful in removing the false impressions of the Mexicans in relation to the United States, and in inducing them to confide in the assurance you have already given that their religious institutions will be respected, the property of the Church protected, their worship undisturbed, and in fine all their religious rights will be in the amplest manner preserved to them. In fulfilling those objects you are desired to give these gentlemen such facilities as you may be enabled to afford, and at such times as in your judgment may be most prudent.

You are requested also to cause to be provided for them such accommodations as will render their abiding with the Army comfortable to themselves. It is believed that when chaplains were allowed by law to the Army, they received in pay and emoluments from \$1,000 to \$1,200 per annum. This amount will be paid to the gentlemen named in this letter.

As these gentlemen do not speak Spanish they have been desired by the President to associate with them another clergyman who both understands and speaks it; such person recommended by them you will receive on the same footing as themselves.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,  
W. L. MARCY,  
Secretary of War.

Major-General Z. Taylor,  
Commanding Army of Occupation  
on the Rio Grande, Texas.

The letters issued to the chaplains to facilitate the details of their traveling and accommodations on the way to the front were worded in this fashion:

War Department, May 29, 1846.

Sir,

The Reverend gentlemen (Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey), who will hand you this, are the bearers of a communication from this department to Major-General Taylor, who will please provide them with cabin passages, in good sufficient transport to Point Isabel, whence they will receive safe conduct to General Taylor's Headquarters.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,  
W. L. MARCY,  
Secretary of War.

Lieutenant-Colonel Thos. Hunt,  
Deputy-Quartermaster General,  
United States Army,  
New Orleans.

The letter to the commanding officer at Fort Polk, Point Isabel, Texas, said:

War Department, May 29, 1846.

Sir,

The Reverend Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey are the bearers of a communication from this department to Major-General Taylor; they are recommended to your courtesy and hospitality, and you are requested to take such measures as will ensure their safe conduct to the headquarters of General Taylor.

Very respectfully yours, etc.,

W. L. MARCY,  
Secretary of War.

Fathers McElroy and Rey left Georgetown on June 2, 1846, and arrived at Fort Polk on July 2. In the hospital there they found fifteen wounded Catholic soldiers all Irish except two, who were Mexicans. Thence they passed on to Matamoras which was reached four days later. The Mexican *Padre Cura Rodriguez* received them hospitably and invited them to stop with him, but they took rooms in the house of an American paying him \$10 a week for their board. When they called on General Taylor he "received us in the most friendly manner and begged us to give him the opportunity of rendering us all the service in his power." Father McElroy thought Matamoras had no houses of importance, "no good churches . . . so much for the effects of the revolution. Since the Spanish yoke was cast off not one church as yet has been erected throughout all Mexico whereas in towns existing when the revolt commenced are to be found good substantial churches well adorned."

Early in August General Taylor advanced to Comargo on the road to Monterey, and as a large proportion of his command were Catholics Father Rey accompanied him. He was present at the battle of Monterey fearlessly ministering to the combatants, but, some time after, venturing out into the country alone he was murdered by Mexican guerillas. His body was never recovered. Father Rey was born at Lyons, France, March 19, 1807, and became a Jesuit novice in Switzerland in 1827. From 1840 he had labored in the United States as professor of philosophy at Georgetown, as Secretary to the Provincial and Vice-president of Georgetown College.

Father McElroy continued to act as chaplain for most of the

war and then returned to Boston where he labored for seventeen years during which time he built the Church of the Immaculate Conception and founded Boston College. He frequently visited New York and was with Archbishop Hughes when that prelate died. In 1868 he lost his eyesight, but an operation restored it for five years. He then became totally blind. Born in 1782, in the County Fermanagh, Ireland, he landed in Baltimore in 1803. Three years later he entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Georgetown and was ordained priest in May, 1817. As he lived until September 12, 1877, he was a link from the days of Carroll almost to our own.

Apropos of this Mexican war episode it may be noted that, when thirteen negro soldiers were hanged for mutiny at San Antonio recently, the Associated Press sent out a statement from Washington that there was no precedent in the annals of the United States Army for such an execution of mutineers save one case of the members of "St. Patrick's Battalion," who had deserted to the Mexicans at Chapultepec, and having been captured by General Scott's soldiers were shot by his orders. I sent to Washington for the official data of this Chapultepec case and Adjutant-General McCain answered with the statement that a search of the official records had been made several times and nothing had been found concerning the "St. Patrick's Battalion" episode. He said he regarded it as a myth, and that various persons had tried in years past to find something authoritative about it but without success. The infernal slander of the statement and the malice of its originators, who have sent it broadcast on several recent occasions, are perfectly obvious.

### COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.*

#### Newman's Correspondence

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Replying to Mr. Thomas F. Marshall, who, in the issue of AMERICA for February 2 seeks a reason for the non-appearance of letters to W. G. Ward, Hope-Scott and Faber, in the "Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman," might one suggest that most probably there was no correspondence between the great Tractarian leader and the gentlemen in question previous to the year 1838? Hope-Scott, Ward and Faber can hardly be called contemporaries of Newman. Born respectively twelve, fourteen and twelve years after the great Oratorian, they were undergraduates at Oxford when John Keble in July, 1833, mounted the pulpit-stairs of St. Mary the Virgin to sound the tocsin of the great movement, and consequently (with the possible exception of Hope-Scott) unknown to Newman at the time the movement got under way. It is only by the widest acceptance of the term that they can really be called Tractarians at all. Certainly, we have the Cardinal's own word for it that Ward was not. "Your father," he writes to Mr. Wilfrid Ward as recently as 1885, "was never a High Churchman, never a Tractarian, never a Puseyite, never a Newmanite." They were all three of that body of younger men who "cut into the original movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought and set about turning that line in their own direction." This, if we are to believe Newman's own words, was about the year 1838, when he first met Ward and Faber.

Jersey City.

FRANCIS J. MC CONVILLE.

#### Our Oldest Girls' School

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Would you kindly allow me to call attention to an error in historical data in an article published in AMERICA for December 22, 1917? Our copies of AMERICA, whose weekly advent we hail with so much pleasure, have been very much delayed in the mails

during the last six weeks. This accounts for our not having written to you at an earlier date.

In the interesting article entitled "The Patron of the Destroyer Jacob Jones," by Thomas F. Meehan, we read the following:

Commodore Jacob Jones was the father of Sister "Stanny" Jones, who, from 1825-1879, was one of the most famous educators at the Academy of the Visitation, Georgetown, D. C., the oldest Catholic institution for the higher education of women in the United States.

The Catholic Encyclopedia gives June 24, 1799, as the day of the opening of the school in Georgetown. The Ursulines arrived in New Orleans on August 7, 1727, and within a few days began their zealous labors as educators of the young girls of the colony and of the newly founded city of New Orleans (1718). One of these pioneer Ursulines, writing to her father in France, on October 27, 1727, speaks of "more than thirty boarders" in the academy, besides a larger number of day pupils.

New Orleans.

S. S. S.

[Our correspondent is assuredly aware of the fact that Louisiana was not ceded to the United States by France until December 20, 1803. The writer of the article in question meant to imply nothing more than that the Visitation Convent of Georgetown, D. C., was the oldest of the Catholic educational institutions for the higher education of women founded in the original United States territory.—ED. AMERICA.]

#### Some Irish Old and New

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Mr. Philip J. Libby, on whose letter, published in a previous issue, Mr. J. O'Brien made some comments in AMERICA for February 2, passed to his eternal reward on December 18, 1917, fortified by all the rites of our beloved Catholic religion. He was a man of profound scholarship and sound and unostentatious learning. As one of his life-long friends, I should like to answer Mr. O'Brien's letter, and reply to a few of his remarks, pointing out those which show some reason in their argument, or which seem to me important. An education at some of our secular universities, near Boston, would have produced in the scholar some of the qualities hinted at in Mr. O'Brien's letter, but Mr. O'Brien is profoundly ignorant of a Holy Cross training, otherwise his letter would bear a different tone. His conjecture as to the origin of Mr. Libby's family is very amusing, being, like Mahomet's coffin, "between the devil and the deep sea." An argument should be followed by facts, not conjectures based upon the dreams of the imagination. Mr. Libby's family came from the counties Cavan and Meath; "whose families were never anything in Ireland" is an argument of little weight; statements can easily be made without fear of successful contradiction, especially when the facts and data are 3,000 miles away from the scene of the argument. A loose thinker may content himself with a single statement or expression for a large class of related ideas; hasty conclusions are sometimes made upon unverified information. Mr. O'Brien ought to know that a question cannot be answered by asking another. I still insist that he has not convinced me that Mr. Libby was not right in every respect when he penned the statements contained in the letter which was published. The writer has one regret in life: he received his education in a secular university; if he had to begin life over again he would choose a Catholic college to equip himself for the battle of life, but, thanks to good Catholic parents, he has succeeded in retaining the faith, which he came dangerously near losing in a secular university.

Boston.

JOSEPH MATTHEW SULLIVAN.

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

In your issue of February 9, L. J. attempts to diagnose the Irish character and comes to the conclusion that the average

Irishman is a "truckler of a very vicious species." Both the "mere" Irish and the "made-over" Irish come in for their share of denunciation. I think that one or two of the statements therein made might stand correction. In general L. J. finds that the Irish, as a race, have displayed very little constructive ability here in America. The Irish, in my opinion, have contributed more than any other race to the upbuilding of this country. In the first place they have come here, made their homes here and become citizens here. They have brought up their children as loyal and patriotic Americans, and in time of war, as history will attest, they have been at the forefront as defenders and preservers of the Union. Likewise they have been the upbuilders of religion and morality among us. What position would the Church in America hold today in the eyes of the world had the Irish, clergy and laity alike, been shirkers and slackers and not upbuilders? The presence of the Irish in America, as an integral race, has been a living protest against the decadance of morals, which is so rapidly becoming a characteristic of the American people. Now this is more than can be said of some other races. Do not these efforts to preserve both the Church and the State show constructive ability? If not, what more could be asked for? As for an example of "aping the English," L. J. would be wiser if he looked to the Vanderbilts, Goulds, "Walled-off" Astors and other native, well-bred and blue-blooded aristocrats than to the Irish. Perhaps they have not fashioned their manners after the rules of Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy, but at least let credit be given where credit is due.

Manchester, N. H.

J. M.

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

The Irish should be organized, writes E. J. S. in your issue of February 9, they should be taught the glories of the Irish in Ireland and America. But I would add that they should be taught the glories of the past only as motives for making men of Gaelic blood glorious in the future. The emphasis must be laid on the glorious deeds that the Irish should accomplish. Irish glory, and this they must be taught above all things, is spiritual glory, or it is nothing. The Irish have accomplished no work worthy of the world's admiration, but apostolic work. In this their glory is transcendent. Talent they have, but their sensitive psychology is such that they need an apostolic motive, a spiritual motive to sustain them to the completion of any task.

It is a mistake to imagine that the Irish in America are unorganized. They have organizations, but often they have not the right motives for such organization held before them. An Irish organization whose motto is not "For God and Souls" can only breed children of violence or a gospel of hate. The Irish who bicker, lack charity; they also lack broad education. And here, to my mind, lies the crux of the Irish problem in America. The sons and daughters of Irishmen who have made money here, have only learned by their education that the bickering Irish are absurd. They have not learned what they should be taught, that they are the natural leaders of the Irish in America. They have a mission to convince America that the Irish have traditions, pre-eminently that of St. Patrick: "Souls must be saved at any sacrifice." There are corollaries which follow from this. All the old families can study them in their great men who laid all their talents at the service of the Church, whether as laymen or as priests.

Too many children of Irishmen, who have graduated from Catholic colleges and academies, think they do enough if they stay in the Church. They are in a state of transition. It is dangerous. They should make friends with the "organized Irish," from whom disgust has too often estranged them. They should try to solve the Irish problem in America. In Irish celebrations there is too much recurrence to the past; too much flag-waving, too many periodic sentences. We must talk about the future,

and a spiritual future at that. We have other things to do besides freeing Ireland.

Baltimore.

G. O'N.

#### Drifting on Shoals

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Of all fundamental conditions of society none is of greater moment than that of the propagation and preservation of the human race. Beside it all other sociological and material conditions fade into insignificance. It is self-evident that only a few decades without a single birth would mean practically universal depopulation, and though the supposition is an improbability, still we are undoubtedly facing a diminishing birth-rate, especially among the better class of American-born citizens. There is no need of statistics to support the above: we need only compare the number of children born twenty-five years ago in our immediate neighborhood with the number born these days, and I feel certain the comparison will drive home the point.

It is the great middle class, the class from which have sprung, and from which will continue to spring, the ablest, the cleanest and the best of men and women, which leavens the whole mass and constitutes the backbone of our nation. In this class, the birth-rate has most materially fallen off. This means that the curse of selfishness is sapping the very roots of life. It means the decay of spiritual ideas, the death of true patriotism, and the breaking up of homes. It means the divorce court and the triumph of sensualism. It means the loss of the incalculable benefits of parenthood.

The responsibility which children bring inculcates self-denial and self-restraint. Thinking for others becomes a habit. Those who are childless through their own wrong-doing, do not know the pleasures of self-denial; their natures become narrow, selfish and warped, and their souls self-indulgent. It is a truism that from large, well-born families come our best citizens. They early learn self-reliance, are free from false sentiment, are tolerant and helpful, without the egotism and self-consciousness so commonly seen in the only child. Luxury seldom enters into such a home, satiety is unknown with its blasé expression, want may even show its gaunt shadow. Despite this, there are more manly men and womanly women found in large families, and more real happiness than is ever dreamed of by a childless couple, or where a single child is surfeited, stunted and spoiled by needless luxury and display. The large families of our forefathers were big factors in the upbuilding of our country. But we are slowly drifting upon the shoals of a decreasing birth-rate, on which France has already stranded her best hopes, with the selfishness, worldly prudence and sensualism for which it has stood sponsor.

We are not brought into this world for ourselves alone. Humanity has placed a heavy mortgage upon each one of us and demands satisfaction, or she will exact a penalty. And is it a hard mortgage to satisfy? Is a little bundle of pink and white helplessness so very objectionable? Is there anything in this world—position, wealth, honor or achievement—that can balance it? Parents know there is not. It is to the little graves we turn and not to the larger mounds, in our keenest anguish; to the little graves our hearts are drawn in our hour of triumph. The little shoes, the little dresses, the little tin soldiers covered with rust, and the memories sweeter than dreams of a honeymoon—these are life's immortelles that never fade.

There is a certain proportion of marriages, proportionately small in numbers, that are unfruitful through no individualistic cause; but as a rule, the childless couple is childless, and the one-child family is limited to a single offspring, through deliberate restriction. What reasons and what influences are operating to produce this state of affairs? They are many and various: the extra expense which children bring, plus selfishness that refuses to deprive itself of any pleasure or luxury for the child. Many young men in the various walks of life will not marry

until financial success is an established fact, or, if they do marry, they refuse to be burdened with children. Girls who had been earning their own living previous to marriage, and who often acquire erroneous ideas of life through their associations, frequently refuse motherhood. Another factor is life in boarding houses or apartments where children are taboo. It is considered almost vulgar and bourgeois in a certain class to have a family. How the modern mother pities her darling daughter if she be an expectant mother! Many, many reasons, but never a valid one, and every one of them based on selfish motives. The world does homage to the man who works and the soldier who fights, but to a greater extent should a civilized community do homage and reverence to the married woman who performs her duty.

Montreal.

W. A. L. STYLES, M.D.

#### The "Non-Sectarian" Y. M. C. A.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am under the impression that the following account of my experience as an American and a Catholic with the "non-sectarian" organization known as the Y. M. C. A., will not only interest the readers of AMERICA, but will also open their eyes to the realization of the anti-Catholic and un-American body of women and men at the helm. In the first week of December I applied through that organization for the opportunity of going "Over There" as a canteen worker. I was some few years beyond their age limit, but to that they made no objection, for they had sent over many just as old, and older, so long as I was physically fit and could pass their physician's examination. They did not, as you will see later, give me a chance to comply with this last requirement. I was accepted, references being satisfactory, with gusto, for two reasons: I had offered to pay all my own expenses, amounting to not less than \$3,000 a year, and I am thoroughly at home in the French language and know northern France and its people. Before leaving their office I made out my application papers and gave the four references usually required. The latter were looked up at once, possibly with the hope that there would be a loophole for refusing me. Among the written questions is "What is your denomination?" The secretary, Mr. Hamlin, who looked over my paper and noticed what mine was, immediately began telling me of the most harrowing conditions "over there," and asked whether I was "quite sure," and so forth, that I could "stand it." To all this I had one reply, "Yes."

Finally at the end of five weeks I received a letter asking me to meet the Appointment Committee at the Y. M. C. A. This consisted of two women, Mrs. Mead and Mrs. Cutting. The former, while very courteous, began the same tactics as Mr. Hamlin, placing horror after horror before me. As I was not to be daunted, the latter could hold out no longer and blurted out, "You are a Roman Catholic, are you not?" When I looked my surprise at the question, and asked what religion had to do with an American citizen trying to do her duty toward her country, her response was, "Why do you not go to France under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus? They are in the field to compete with us." The result of all this was to postpone their decision for three weeks more. By this time I had decided to push them to the wall and make them show their hand. I was called again to meet the "Appointment Committee," the hour set being 10 a. m., and after waiting an hour and a half, I was permitted to meet the "Appointment Committee" (of one), Mrs. Slade. Without loss of time she informed me that they had just received a cable from France not to send over any more canteen workers at present. By this time you will observe that they had had me on their list eight weeks. When I questioned her true reason for refusing and accused her of being influenced by the sectarian principles of the Y. M. C. A., and as proof called attention to the question, "What is your denomination?" on the application paper, she answered, "That is for the purpose

of securing religious workers. As a matter of fact those with whom we have had trouble abroad are our workers who lay claim to no religion." So you will observe that anyone so long as he is not a Catholic may go abroad through the Y. M. C. A.

These canteen workers of the Y. M. C. A. do not, as is generally supposed, live in the huts built by the Y. M. C. A., but live in the houses of the peasants of France. Is it not possible to send over half a dozen Catholic women who could look over the ground and start the ball rolling? Once on the spot it would be easier to decide just what is needed. From this distance the matter seems much more complicated than it is in reality. It is much to be regretted, when our country needs every available man or woman who is willing to do his or her duty that the question of what church you attend, or whether the first initial of your religion is a "C" or a "P" should be the cause of holding back those who consider themselves capable of benefiting our soldiers on the other side.

New York.

S. T. C.

#### Worse than Apathy

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of January 26 there was an interesting letter from Mr. Michael Williams, who justly complains of Catholic inertia and gives an illustration of its damaging effects. Such a complaint might be lodged against Catholics in every city, with few exceptions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in Canada as well as in the United States. But while the subject is under consideration I might take occasion to register a complaint against not only the inertia and apathy of Catholics, but also against the hostility of Catholics to our defense of the Church through the medium of the secular press. Even when it does happen, as in the case of Ottawa, Canada, that the newspapers allow us to present the Catholic side of the case, we meet with a chorus of protests from our people, who attempt to discourage us in our endeavors to uphold the Faith. Were this my own personal experience alone I would regard the protests as a hint of my own incompetence to deal publicly with the various questions that come up. But I find on consulting other persons, clerical and lay, of undoubted ability, that they, too, have been discouraged in similar efforts.

What is the cause of this opposition? It seems to me that we in America, or to be more precise, the Irish Catholics in America, who have been emancipated from the condition of slavery under the British oligarchy, have not yet realized what that emancipation means. We still imagine, as the Canadian *Freeman* remarks, that we live in penal times, or rather, that we exist on the sufferance of our former oppressors, or that we are beholden to Protestant benevolence for our present liberty. This is a delusion that may have disastrous consequences if we persist in it. If we do not take advantage of our freedom to dispel ignorance concerning the Church, its doctrines and its aims, we may once again be reduced to a position of subservience, or see the influence of the Church decline. Witness the alarming state of the Philippines after three centuries of Catholicism. Behold Mexico. When have the enemies of the Church ceased in their attacks, or drawn the line as to how far they would go in oppressing us?

If we are not called upon to suffer for the Faith in these countries it is because we are enjoying the fruits of the sufferings of our forefathers. But our fancied security should not make us fail to defend the Faith, whenever and wherever it is attacked. Our pens are our weapons. We should keep them ever ready for use. With the Masonic forces, with their agnostic cult, holding a strong grip on education in North America, we have a tremendous battle to fight, not only to safeguard the Church, but to uphold Christianity.

Ottawa, Can.

E. O.

## AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSlein; Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

## SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00

Canada, \$3.50

Europe, \$4.00

## Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

## The Magazine Campaign Against the Pope

ONE of the most outrageous calumnies against Benedict XV, the Italian clergy, and the Catholic Church that has appeared since the beginning of the war, was given a place of prominence in the *Saturday Evening Post* for February 9. The manner in which that weekly has met the protests of outraged Catholics leaves but one conclusion possible. It is that decent men of every faith, and all good Americans, whose first aim is a united drive against the common enemy, will henceforth feel obliged to avoid a magazine whose editors are either too ignorant to know that they are disseminating calumny, or perfectly willing to malign a religion to which forty per cent of America's fighting forces give allegiance.

In an article grotesquely misnamed "The Red Cross in Italy," Miss Elizabeth Frazer undertakes to outline the cause of the Italian reverses in the campaign in the North. "The chief coefficients," she finds in "the destructive peace propaganda carried on by the Austrians, the Catholics, and the Italian Socialist party . . . instigated, of course, from Wilhelmstrasse." That is to say, Italian Catholics, and first of all Italian priests, joined with the Socialists, Germans and Austrians, to preach treason. For Miss Frazer leaves us under no manner of misapprehension. "And so peace talk began to spread and to be disseminated—first by the parish priests in obscure country villages among the women whose husbands and sweethearts were bearing the brunt of the war," and, after the ground had been prepared by these false priests, the propaganda was continued by the Socialists and the Austrians. This carefully calculated scale gives to Catholic priests the first place in the ranks of dishonor. "So peace was breathed into their ears by their wives and sweethearts, and voiced openly by the Pope." The result was inevitable. It was the Italian rout.

In view of facts which all the world knows, it is difficult to see how the *Saturday Evening Post* can advance the excuse of ignorance, or escape the charge of a delib-

erate attack upon the loyalty of the Italian Catholic clergy and the good faith of the Holy Father. To the patriotism of the hierarchy, the Italian Government itself has borne witness, reluctant, perhaps, but unmistakable. In England, Cardinal Bourne forced the withdrawal of the miserable calumny uttered against the Holy Father by the *Morning Post*, while certain journals which unwarily preferred charges against Cardinal Merry del Val, were dealt with in summary fashion by the former Papal Secretary of State. How the *Saturday Evening Post* can have remained in ignorance of these facts is inexplicable. Furthermore, the Cardinal Secretary of State has been followed by a number of the Italian hierarchy in his open challenge to the calumniators of the Italian priesthood. These challenges have been met by further calumny in Italy and France, and now, it would seem, the campaign is to be introduced into the United States by a publication which claims the largest circulation of all American weeklies.

Are Americans, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, prepared to allow the campaign of calumny, engineered by men who hate the Catholic Church simply and solely because they hate Almighty God, to begin its operations in this country? In all good faith, many Americans accepted the persecution of the Church and of the Religious Orders in France, which began some fifteen years ago, as the just revolt of a burdened State against a tyrannical hierarchy. Only within recent years have they begun to understand that the powers which closed the churches in France and expelled inoffensive priests and nuns, are identified with the forces which would gladly tear Almighty God out of the heart of every citizen. It is that same spirit which today engineers the "drive on the Pope." Not without treason to our highest ideals can Americans allow this infamous thing an entrance into our united Christian country. The plain duty of the *Saturday Evening Post*, and of the Red Cross in Italy, so generously supported by American Catholics in their poverty, is a prompt and complete disavowal of Miss Frazer's utterly unfounded charges.

## No Hymns of Hate

THE Committee on Public Information has issued an instruction, urging its "Four-Minute Men" to give no countenance to those insane diatribes against the enemy which have been aptly termed "hymns of hate." By this wise action the Committee has made the country its debtor. Contrary to a rather common persuasion, fostered by certain public journals and public speakers, the Committee believes that even in war hatred is out of place. From the military standpoint, it is always useless, and ordinarily, hurtful. A soldier who spends his hours trying to think up new motives for hating the Turks and the Germans, will have no more time for keen and careful fighting than the old woman who employed all her days in the chimney-corner, nursing her wrath to keep it warm. For "a busy man," observes the Committee,

"thinks mainly of his work," and the work of the soldier is to fight, according to the directions of his superior officer. "Frightful resolves" stirred by the recital of some atrocity, and carried into effect by deeds of individual rashness, have no place in a disciplined army. Our cause is just, and we are battling for the preservation of Christian ideals of truth and honor, which must be kept unscathed, if Europe is to remain civilized. For this reason, if for no other, appeals to so base and selfish a passion as hatred are altogether deplorable.

It is worthy of note, however, that the Committee's excellent instruction seems to be quite unaware of the distinction so familiar to all Catholics, of the vast difference between hating the sin, and hating the sinner. One is a Christian duty, the other, a transgression of the natural as well as of the Christian law. No one ever hated sin as did our Blessed Saviour, because as God, He alone understood its unmeasured evil, yet no one ever bore so great a love to sinners as He who died that they might live. In the present great conflict, we can have nothing but hatred for the greed and dishonor which has brought woe unutterable to half the world. As children of God, followers of Christ, we must hate sin above all things, and show our hatred, first of all, by keeping sin out of our own souls, and by doing all that we can to keep it from the souls of others. But in our conduct towards the sinner himself we fallible and short-sighted mortals can strive for no higher model than is exhibited in Him who was called the Friend of sinners. To give all that our country asks, generously and in abundance, that the war may be brought to a successful conclusion, thereby re-establishing the world on a firmer basis of peace and prosperity, is our plain duty, both as Catholics and as citizens. But as for those who are our enemies, let us ask from on high the strength which will enable us to utter with sincerity the words of our Blessed Saviour on Calvary, "Father, forgive them." For in truth, "they know not what they do."

#### Foolish Imaginings

THE sinking of the *Tuscania* and the consequent anxiety that tortured countless hearts in the interval between the announcement of the fact and the publication of the names of the victims have emphasized a tendency of the human mind which it is worth while to point out. By some strange inborn fatality the imagination of those who love is prone to run riot in timorous apprehension and gloomy foreboding upon the least pretext. By preference it conjures up the very worst and paints the most improbable disasters in such vivid colors as to give them a semblance of reality when they are only the creations of a disordered fancy. Men and women, who are wise, exercise a strong control over their imaginations and refuse to accept hallucinations as facts.

It is nothing less than folly to weep over the possible contingencies of the future. They may never come to

pass, and in that case the tears shed over them are idle. There is no justification for the weakness of those who torment themselves with the prospect of sorrows that may never materialize; and people who allow themselves to be made the sport of such illusions show a lack of self-control that is reprehensible. Sensible people turn their minds from the contemplation of foolish phantasms almost as ruthlessly as they do from thoughts against faith. Such imaginings can only do harm, they cannot possibly do good. Wise precautions, based on cold reason, should of course be taken to prevent catastrophes; but to let the fantasy dangle before the anguished mind the details of cruel bereavement or bitter sufferings, that are at most merely possibilities, is not only useless but positively wrong. Let us wait until such things actually come to pass, we shall then have time, and enough, to lament them.

#### Savage Philosophy

Q UITE recently a writer in a popular magazine denounced with a great show of indignation the "savage" philosophy of Prussia. To it he laid the world's ills, the groans and wasted blood of men, the sighs and tears of women and children. And he was right, for the Prussian military caste, intent on rapine, found a ready instrument of infamy in Kant, Goethe and Nietzsche, three apostles of emotion, who did much to obliterate from men's minds the saving idea of an objective norm of truth, entirely distinct from human whims and superior to them. The progress from Kant's practical reason, through Goethe's *Gefühl ist alles* to "Zarathustra," on whose pages the superman howls like an enraged demon, is easy and swift, for once emotions are exalted above intellect and will, degeneracy is instant to follow. The higher passions of the soul are soon submerged by the lower, and the claws of the beast forthwith appear. This is just what happened in Prussia, to the delight of the army, which was quick to erect the philosophy of crass passions into a coherent system of sheer brutality which aggrandizes itself at the cost of the blood of innocent folk.

The popular writer was correct in his estimate of Prussianism, but it is to be regretted that his drive ended with philosophy. A step further would have brought him to Prussian theology as evolved and expounded by such men as Ritschl and Schleiermacher. In this he would have found cause for more furious epithets, more vigorous denunciations. But perhaps he was sensitive of the feelings of theologians, and in the present crisis this is not a bad trait. But it is distinctly bad, and maybe cowardly, not to have uttered a word of warning against destructive tendencies in American thought. Such exist and have existed for some time past. Indeed, it is difficult to see how any German could be more lawless than Emerson, for instance; more blasphemous than Alcott, more reckless of standards than James. We have been saved from Prussianism not because our philosophy has been better

than Prussia's, but rather because the individualism and innate sense of decency of most Americans prevented the erection of blasphemy and wild emotions into a system. For this we should be thankful, and in gratitude for our escape from such turpitude we should see to it that America shall never be brought to blush because of the ravings of those who set themselves up as leaders of thought.

#### The Good Novelist's Tasks

THE late Mgr. Benson believed that nowadays the most effective way of teaching apologetics is through the medium of the artistically constructed novel. How successful he himself was in making that conviction practical is proved by the vogue his works of fiction have enjoyed. Protestants and agnostics who read his stories eagerly imbibed without realizing it the principles of Catholic belief and practice, while the children of the Church, who followed absorbingly the arguments for the truths of Catholicism which he so deftly wove into his plots, finished each successive Benson-book prouder than ever of their faith and better equipped than before to defend it. Such authors as John Ayscough, Canon Sheehan, Henri Bordeaux, René Bazin, Hefiry Harland, Mrs. Craigie and Miss Clarke in their novels have achieved with consummate artistry the same objects as Mgr. Benson. The tasks these authors set themselves are not easy ones to accomplish. For the thoughtful and responsible writer of today, as described by Professor Sherman, must know:

How to present a view of life both wise and brave, answering to experience as well as to desire, serviceable to art as in the daily walk . . . How to give pleasure without corrupting the heart, and how to give wisdom without chilling it. How to bring into play the great passions of men without unchaining the beast . . . How to recognize the role of the nerves in human actions without paralyzing the nerve of action. How to admit the weakness of man without dashing his heroism. How to see his acts and respect his intentions. How to renounce his superstitions and retain his faith. How to rebuke without despising him. How to reform society without rebelling against it. How to laugh at its follies without falling into contempt. How to believe that evil is fleeing forever before good, but will never be overtaken and slain. How to look back upon a thousand defeats, and yet cling to the fighting hope.

If every high-principled fictionist, while keeping the interest of his readers sustained, and maintaining a fine quality of literary workmanship, has to discover a satisfying solution of the foregoing problems, a Catholic novelist, who is gifted with the qualities requisite for a successful story-teller, ought to find the problems mentioned easier to meet and settle than does the Protestant or unbelieving writer. For the Catholic novelist has at his command the deep knowledge of the human heart possessed by the ancient Church; he hears her living voice explaining the meaning and the application of God's eternal laws, and he knows with the certainty of Divine faith that her teaching is true.

But the Catholic novelist, however gifted he may be,

seems fated to receive but scanty practical appreciation from large numbers of his coreligionists. Some will praise him enthusiastically but seldom read his books. Other Catholics, largely of the "wish-bone" type, will greet the mention of his name with a scornful sniff and bury themselves in a best-seller that "everybody is reading." Larger numbers still, because they have never learned to feel interest in any "literature" but the newspapers and the cheap magazines, are not even aware that Catholic novels exist. An excellent Lenten "devotion" for these three classes of Catholics to adopt would be the cultivation of a first-hand acquaintance with the works of our standard Catholic novelists.

#### Soldiers at Attention

FROM Camp Johnston, in Jacksonville, Florida, comes a letter which doubtless is but one of many that could be written in a similar vein. It tells of the wonderful success of a mission just given to our soldier boys by four Dominican Fathers. So great were the throngs in attendance that it was necessary to hold four services each day. At the earliest Mass two of the priests were daily occupied for more than half an hour in giving Communion to the men. Yet to attend this Mass the Catholic soldiers were obliged to rise an hour before reveille. On the closing day of the mission two priests continued for over an hour and a half to distribute the Holy Eucharist to the rows of eager soldiers that succeeded each other without intermission at the Holy Table. Some 2,000 listened in the open air to Father Cahill's closing peal of eloquence, impassioned with patriotic fire.

A great deal of apostolic work is done by the men, writes the Knights of Columbus chaplain apropos of the Massachusetts soldiers gathered in this camp. They bring in delinquents, and those out of the fold who seek for instruction. Their religion is as open as a book. They do not parade it; they simply live it with great simplicity. Thus a number of them, on the way from the North, did not hesitate to recite their beads in public. "How many Catholics here?" asked one of them as he looked about in the car. Twenty or more gave the sign. "Come on up to the front and say the beads." There they gathered, knelt down, and said their rosary aloud. I tell them, adds the chaplain with enthusiasm, they put the "Mass" in Massachusetts.

In this spirit of religious devotion our country possesses the most unfailing assurance of success that can be given her. These men will be loyal to their Flag as to their Faith. They will be an honor to their nation as to their Church. They will preserve their hearts pure and their thoughts chaste, so that the strength of each will be as the strength of ten. They will not flinch before the foe as they do not flinch before those who might fail to respect the sacredness of their religious devotion. They will, in fine, respect the dignity of womanhood, whether at home or abroad, as they honor in the sight of men the Virgin Motherhood of her who brought to us the world's salvation, Christ her Son, the Model of every militant Catholic.

# Literature

## "MY FAVORITE AUTHOR"

If you have ever made the experiment you have perhaps already noticed that few of your friends have favorite books or authors; and that of those few fewer still honestly enjoy a real favorite. Real favorites, I say, because it is so easy to deceive one's self in selecting or declaring a favorite author; and even if one has selected and declared, having is not using, nor is saying doing.

Where we are most apt to deceive ourselves in a "favorite" is with the vogue authors. Here that most elusive elf, vanity, will change mud to gold before our very eyes. What a pity it is to hear a high-school innocent proclaiming her infatuation with Browning when we know that not even the dons have cracked the Browning nut! The story of the society belle who had sounded the depths of Scott is not exaggerated. She was expressing her love of Sir Walter to a Southern colonel in terms like "adorable Ivanhoe," "enthralled Kenilworth," "sublime Guy Mannering" and so on, until at last the colonel coughed knowingly and asked for an appreciation of "Scott's Emulsion." "More wonderful than Ivanhoe!" was the exclamation. Such a blind friendship with vogue authors is not rare. We are too prone to read an author because other people do so, to be up to date. We profess to enjoy his company because fashion says he is a remarkable writer. If this is the way we reckon our favorite author, then those charming personalities who attract us on an initial meeting when all we know of their characters or sympathies has come by hearsay, may be said to be our favorite friends. How many air-baskets would not Aristophanes have for vogue authors if he lived today, that their coterie of gullibles might clasp hands in rapture, affecting to love what they do not in the least understand and to understand what they have never thought about at all!

Sometimes it happens that the vogue author is our favorite because he satisfies our passion for excitement rather than our thirst for friendship. O. Henry or Rudyard Kipling may become our favorites merely because they are full of the little surprises of life, require little of our attention, and are easy reading. True, most readers will have these "delightful writers" for friends and find in them much to love and admire, but these friendships are not based on sympathies that elevate and inspire.

Closely allied to the vogue favorite is the authorized favorite. Here instead of fashion or love of ease being the tyrant over our predilections it is literary authority. Of course, there is nothing like favoring the very best, but it is not necessary, and often not discreet. When we choose our friends we favor those whom, according to principle, we like best as most suitable for us. Shakespeare and Milton, Scott and Dickens, Burke and Newman are not the best authors for every spirit, much less favorites. Nine out of ten times those who boast of them as favorites must get in the rear and push themselves to read them. They are then favorites of the will, not of the heart. Because Olympus thunders "Shakespeare," we tie ourselves down to that book and suffer the embarrassment of misplaced sympathies instead of turning to more simple and congenial authors until the time is ripe for making a more hearty and hopeful trial.

The making of true friends can seldom be forced. Kindred spirits meet, smile, shake hands and fuse together unconsciously. If you find a best author your best friend, very well. Richard Grant White says something about reaching from his rocking horse—or was it his high-chair?—for his Shakespeare. A happy predilection! We can surely learn to love the best authors, and every encouragement should be given to the person who says "I will"; but only when we have learned to give them the first

place in our hearts, and not during the days of formalities, can we honestly call them our favorites. Our first meeting with books is generally vicarious. And the grown-up who introduces us may become a good or a bad angel for us. A youth of twenty once startled a friend by declaring that he was four books deep in his third reading of Dickens. His explanation was that when fourteen, while reading Conan Doyle, his father had suggested that he was old enough to be trying Dickens or Scott, and he had done so with blessed results, now finding in Dickens his best of friends.

There is generally something wrong, too, with the man who has too many favorites, or is constantly changing them. Newman could wander from Addison to Johnson and Gibbon, but always with Cicero at his side. Stevenson could make out a list of "books that have influenced me," but must lead off with Shakespeare, and suggest a special mark of affection for his favorite, Hamlet. Most people will give a whole list of "favorites" with the appendix "I liked them all." But it is often this indefiniteness or fluctuation that hinders their making true particular book-friends. They are like the religious novice who was accused of having "particular" friends. The accuser kept giving names until over half the community had been mentioned; then the novice-master interposed with: "Well, if everyone is his particular friend, he has no favorite."

In the cases mentioned it is clear how one may be deceived in avowing a favorite author. A real favorite is rarer than a particular friend. Your best friend is not likely to be one imposed by fashion or authority, nor a mere popular good-fellow, nor a puppet of self-indulgence, nor one of a dozen equals amidst whom you vacillate. Favorite authors of these stamps are to be suspected. It is better to start all over and to cultivate a true favorite than to be deceived in the possession of a false one.

After all it is a matter of taste whether we favor this or that author. But in any case he must be a friend we like particularly well and preferred before all others, with nothing small or forced in our affections. One we can turn to at any time to feed our minds and console our spirits. In hours of silence he takes us along the paths of happiness, teaching us how to rejoice with simplicity and heartiness, and to act with sincerity and effectiveness, drawing always a smile for mean ambitions and unworthy aims. And when the hours are dark and all seems against us he opens his arms and speaks of courage and love, of the wise and beautiful things of life, or suffering and kindness and God. His old familiar thoughts, his noble feelings, his warm sympathies, studied time and time again, feed our hearts rather than our minds, and give a meaning to life and its nobler things that grows on us with each reading. This friend that knows so much of life, that speaks so well and sympathizes so perfectly with us—this is our favorite author.

A writer once asked what author besides the spiritual writers his readers would take to the death-chamber if given a month to live. Have you one to take? Which one? That is your favorite author.

PAUL J. SWEENEY, S.J.

## REVIEWS

**Epistemology, or the Theory of Knowledge, An Introduction to General Metaphysics.** By P. COFFEY, Ph.D. 2 Vols. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$7.50.

The thinking Catholic who is familiar with Dr. Coffey's excellent volumes on logic and ontology will welcome any philosophical treatise written for our schools of philosophy by this

distinguished master. His preceding books combine clear treatment and an attractive style with a thoroughness unequaled in English text-books on scholastic doctrines. Nor in this respect do they surpass the two volumes under review, which treat of human knowledge itself and the truth-value of that knowledge. Since many a system of false philosophy has gained vogue in schools because of the smooth insinuating style of its author, it is gratifying to find the true doctrine presented as attractively as Dr. Coffey presents it. Outlines of Catholic philosophy we have in abundance, and jejune text-books are multiplied to excess, but their frail frame needs the vivifying spirit of the professor's exposition.

The introduction of the work gives in historical outline the rise and development of theories of knowledge, and calls attention to the fact that the forerunners of the Cartesian and Kantian systems of epistemology lived some centuries before the Christian era; relativism and subjectivism received merely a popular recrudescence at the hands of Descartes and the seer of Jena, Greek sophists and Platonic academies having been long since ready-made prototypes. It is a pleasure to note that the author gives well-merited credit to the lately published manual of philosophy of Père Jeannière, S.J. While the present volumes are designed by their author as "primarily a text-book for the use of university students in philosophy," they are invaluable to the critical inquirer who would have in transparent English a clear and safe solution of those knotty problems which ever cling to the knowing of knowledge. The difficult question of evidence, the supreme criterion of truth and the ultimate motive of certitude, is elaborated *per longum et latum*, though there is necessarily presupposed a full knowledge of the author's volumes on the science of truth. Pragmatism and humanism, popularized by James and Dewey in this country, by Bergson in France and Schiller in England, and still holding sway as our latest philosophical fashion, are treated with conciseness and precision, the dilemmatic syllogism serving as the weapon of attack. Three main arguments are marshaled against the pragmatic school: its logical demolition of all intellectualism, its self-contraction in the relativity of truth and its disastrous moral consequences. The popularity of pragmatism in this country is easily explained by our business tendency, which would put all things, even objective truth, on a strictly practical basis. A splendid refutation of this doctrine is found in the latter half of the second volume.

W. C. N.

**The Riddles of Hamlet and the Newest Answers.** By SIMON A. BLACKMORE, S.J., A.M., Litt.D. Boston: The Stratford Company. \$2.00.

So much has been written about the plays of Shakespeare in general and about Hamlet in particular that it seems as if nothing remained to be said, or at least nothing worth saying. And yet the volume before us proves that Father Blackmore found something new to say, and has said it well. He is intimately acquainted with the principal commentators of Hamlet, but his book is not a mere compilation. Where commentators disagree he ventures to decide, after summing up and weighing the arguments pro and con. He supplies a vast amount of erudition in a comparatively small space, and for that reason his book will be a great saving of time and a valuable aid to Shakespearean scholars, whether professors or students. The most original feature of the book is that it furnishes a new answer to old riddles by viewing controverted points in the light of Hamlet's religion. He shows that the hero was a Catholic by birth and education, that his faith was a living, abiding influence within him, and that his conduct throughout the play must be interpreted according to the principles of Catholicism. This point of view constitutes the chief merit of the book.

The 500-page volume is divided into two parts. The first part

treats of general topics and collateral matter. The second is a detailed commentary. The first chapter examines how far the principal characters can be identified with the contemporaries of Shakespeare. In melancholy and weariness of the world, Hamlet resembles the dramatist himself; in other respects he bears a striking resemblance to Sir Philip Sidney, who was a favorite at the court of Queen Elizabeth. The next four chapters discuss the religion of Denmark in Hamlet's day, his education in Germany, and show that he was not a Positivist, a Pantheist or a Protestant, but a Catholic born and bred. The following chapters expose the nullity of the Queen's marriage, Hamlet's claim to the throne, his supposed madness, his apparent vacillation and other alleged defects of character. The writer holds that to admit the real madness of the Prince is to strip the tragedy of a tragic motive. The hero's hesitation is not due to excessive thinking or to weakness of will, but to real conscientious scruples. He wanted to be quite sure of his uncle's guilt before striking the avenging blow. On this and other important questions it is interesting and instructive to note how the author in his new and well-sustained views controverts the opinions of many famous critics of the past three centuries. The book is an invaluable contribution to Shakespearean literature. The writer lectured on the great dramatist for many years, and the maturity of his scholarship is reflected in his book.

G. N.

**Locomotor Ataxia (Tabes Dorsalis). An Introduction to the Study and Treatment of Nervous Diseases, for Students and Practitioners.** By WILLIAM J. M. A. MALONEY, M.D. (Edin.). New York: D. Appleton & Co., \$3.50.

Locomotor ataxia, or tabes, is a severe disease of the spinal cord which always interferes seriously with locomotion, sometimes makes the patient absolutely bedridden and occasionally adds blindness to its other symptoms. It is probably the most studied of nervous affections, for there is scarcely a distinguished neurologist for the past two generations since the discovery of the disease who has not paid special attention to it. To make a fresh contribution to the subject of locomotor ataxia therefore is a difficult matter. Yet undoubtedly this is what Dr. Maloney has succeeded in doing, for he has invented a mode of treatment not by using drugs, but by so teaching locomotion that bedridden patients have been enabled to walk and those who could get along only with a pair of crutches or a pair of canes have been able to dispense altogether with such aids. The incapacity to walk is due to the loss or the serious disturbance of sensory nerves and the consequent distrust of self which comes as the result of the obscure messages that reach the brain from the affected limbs.

It had long been noted that in the cases where the disease attacked the eyes and blindness resulted, patients suffered much less from ataxia, that is from loss of their power of co-ordination of muscles. Usually the tabetic patient helps out his defective sensations from his limbs by the help of vision and this had always been encouraged by those who have previously treated the disease. Recalling the better co-ordination of blind tabetics, Dr. Maloney blindfolded some of these patients and found that they could be retaught to walk better when they were not disturbed by having to pay so much attention to themselves through their eyes. His observations have thrown so much new light on the whole subject of locomotor ataxia, and have cleared up so many obscure points that his system of treatment will undoubtedly serve to enable a great many who have felt quite incapacitated for ordinary locomotion not only to get out of bed and out of their houses, but even to take up work which they had abandoned before. The book, however, contains much more than the story of Dr. Maloney's discovery, its application and its development, for there is probably no study of locomotor ataxia issued in recent years—and there are many—that is so valuable and suggestive as this. Most of the work was done while the

author was Professor of Neurology at the Fordham University School of Medicine.

J. J. W.

**Fabulae Tusculanae.** Fasc. I-V. **Palaestra.** Part I. By **ARCADIUS AVELLANUS.** New York, 61 West Fifty-second Street.

The series of pamphlets issued by Mr. Arcadius Avellanus, under the general title of the "Tusculan System," is a demonstration of the direct method of teaching Latin for actual use in the classroom. It consists of two parts. The first, "Palaestra," is the primer of the system, which, when completed, will consist of thirty brochures of about sixteen pages each. The second, "Fabulae Tusculanae," a reader made up of fables, old and new, is supplementary to "Palaestra," and designed for use in connection with a Latin grammar. The entire course is calculated to occupy the four years of high-school Latin, and professes to put the student in ready command of an enormous vocabulary and to furnish him with a working knowledge of the principles of syntax, prosody and versification.

This is rather an audacious program, but, at all events, the system has a great deal to commend it. As a manual of the direct method, "Palaestra" is easier to handle than anything of the kind we have seen. For instance, the first lesson, teacher at the blackboard, begins with such obvious pronouncements as "*Hoc est punctum,*" and "*Haec est linea,*" and by ringing the changes on similar phrases throughout some twelve lessons, teacher and pupil find themselves after a week or two running into such adventurous excursions as "*Sunt aliquae litterae quae sunt lineae curvae, tales sunt B, C et etiam aliae; sed litterae A et Z, quae sunt prima et ultima, nequaquam sunt litterae curvae, sed rectae, obliquae et planae.*"

To the system as a whole one practical objection presents itself: to adopt it would involve a radical change in the Latin curriculum sanctioned by long usage and by present authority. Caesar, Cicero and Vergil would be banished from the high school and consigned to the college class exclusively, and hence a large number of students who end their studies with the high school would bid good-bye to Latin before achieving the very end for which—possibly—Latin is set before them. I say possibly; for indeed this is the very *cruix* of the Latin question. We can never decide on the merits of this system or of any other, until we make up our minds what precisely our purpose is in teaching Latin at all. Do we teach Latin primarily that our pupils may be able to speak Latin? Is it in order to acquaint them with the Latin masterpieces of expression? Is it to bring them into contact with Roman life and thought? Is it to cultivate their thinking powers by guiding them through the nice exactitudes of Latin syntax? Here are four distinct ends that would naturally be reached by four distinct methods of teaching. Which one do our Latin teachers set before them as their prime motive? To an observer they would seem to be groping after all four ends promiscuously; and who can be surprised if there is indecision in adopting and adhering steadily to any fixed program?

F. M. C.

**A Glory of Maryland.** Poem by M. S. PINE, Philadelphia; The Salesian Press, \$1.00.

Despite much talking about a renaissance in poetry, rarely does one see a biography done in verse. Yet this is what Sister Mary Paulina of the Georgetown Visitation Convent has successfully accomplished. The subject, whose life-story is the central theme of the poem, is the Most Rev. Leonard Neale, D.D., missionary and apostle of Maryland during our great Republic's period of construction. The chief events of the zealous Archbishop's life, as priest of the Society of Jesus, missionary in British Guiana, Vicar-General, President of Georgetown College, and Archbishop of Baltimore, are related in such a way as to win the reader's admiration. The author has a gift of expression peculiar to poets

who deal in the heroic, as is evidenced by the following apostrophe to the Papacy:

O glorious and undying Papacy!  
Since Christ from His exultant tomb hath risen  
Thou speakest! Thy great Creation hath the race  
Endued with virtue, might, divinest love—  
Fruit of thy Heaven-made Democracy.  
Thy years are ages; lo! the people move  
In multitudinous review  
Before thy throne, firm-set as earth,  
And sink with kings and dynasties into  
Oblivion's arms; while thou shalt boast new birth  
Successive, of thy spirit sovereignty  
O'er the wide emerald globe and watery main. . . .

The poem contains an admirable encomium of the religious state, tributes to the great pioneers of Catholicism in the United States, together with a resumé of the Church's progress during a century or more of its American existence. Notes on the chief characters and the historical events referred to will be found interesting and instructive.

J. H. C.

**The Cruise of the Corwin.** Journal of the Arctic Expedition of 1881 in Search of De Long and the Jeannette. By JOHN MUIR. Edited by WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÈ. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.75.

In July, 1879, Lieutenant George De Long, an American naval officer, set sail from San Francisco in the steam yacht Jeannette in search of the North Pole. Two years later, as it subsequently transpired, the vessel was crushed in the ice and De Long, with ten of his crew of thirty-four, died of exposure and starvation. "The Cruise of the Corwin" is the log of the ship that made an unsuccessful attempt to save Lieutenant De Long and his party. Early in the volume there is a good account of the Aleutian Islands, and their Indian inhabitants, who numbered in 1881 about 2,000, and whose chief occupation was to kill and flay the 100,000 seals taken annually by the Alaskan Commercial Co. Another interesting portion of the volume is the author's description of the Siberian Chukchirs, a hardy Mongolian race, who can sleep peacefully in the open air, with heads uncovered, while an icy wind sweeps by. The author jots down the observations he made of the flora, the fauna and the glaciation of the regions visited during the cruise, gives gruesome pictures of the villages filled with the corpses of Eskimos, who had starved to death, and he has a particularly interesting chapter on "Tragedies of the Whaling Fleet." Mr. Muir writes that in 1871 thirty-three vessels were destroyed at once by a huge ice pack, but their crews escaped. In several places in the book the Arctic hunter is roundly berated for his harsh "treatment of his brother beasts," whose "rights" he refuses to recognize. But the moment the Siberian walruses, reindeer and polar bears begin to be conscious of their "duties," a society will no doubt be formed to protect their "rights."

W. D.

#### BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The February 22 number of the *Catholic Mind* contains Professor Alfred J. Rahilly's lecture on "Faith and Facts," which he delivered before the Catholic students of University College, Cork. He examines the testimony which such well-known unbelievers as Gibbon, Renan, Huxley and Darwin have given regarding the way they lost their faith in Christianity, and shows that the unbelief preceded the investigation of alleged facts. He remarks:

When I am told that such and such a one has suddenly lost the faith by reading a book or by dissecting a slug, I do not for a moment believe that this is the full explanation. His faith was for years being slowly undermined by his own carelessness, it was atrophied from mere disuse, and when the shock came it snapped. Mind, I do not say

that every unbeliever is leading a bad life; that would be a grossly unfair accusation. But I do say that faith is generally lost by disuse or neglect. If you were to lose your eye or your hand, it might be through some disease or cancer. But it is also quite possible to lose it through mere atrophy and want of functioning, in a word, through sheer local starvation. Now faith is sight. You may lose your spiritual sight by acquiring some moral disease, or you may lose it simply by living always in the dark. Men lose their faith because they become blind.

The second paper in the number is the address Edward P. Kilgallen made to the soldiers of Camp Meade, Maryland, on "The Seminarian and the Soldier."

It is to be regretted that the brave and light-hearted soldier who writes such an interesting account of his war-experiences from the day of his enlistment in the First Canadian Contingent until a German bullet put him out of the fight at Ypres, has not a better developed sense of religious and spiritual values. The presence of such an element would round off the book and fill up the gap which everyone who reads the story of "Private Peat" (Bobbs-Merrill, \$1.50) will regretfully observe. The gallant soldier's notions of religion are quite primitive, some of them very unsound. Few war books are so racy, lifelike and full of incident as this. It is not at all of the bookish kind, but records the thoughts and views of a thorough-going soldier set down without gloss or varnish and in right soldierly fashion. It is a vivid picture of all the horrors and, if there be such a thing, the humors of war.

The average reader will probably be unable to make much out of F. Matthias Alexander's "Man's Supreme Inheritance" (Dutton, \$2.00). The book seems to be a jumble of New Thought, Christian Science, evolution, "free expression" and what not. It would appear that the war can be brought to a speedy end, and success and happiness placed within the grasp of everybody if children are only taught to keep an "open mind" and to stand, sit and breathe correctly. There are some good pages on children's play.—Another book which aims to keep the body a perfect instrument of the soul by doing "fifteen minutes work a day for health's sake," is J. P. Müller's "My System" (G. E. Stechert & Co., New York, \$1.00). Forty-four illustrations accompany the detailed description in the text of how to do the various physical exercises prescribed.—"The Theory and Practice of Educational Gymnastics, for Boys' and Girls' High Schools" (John Joseph McVey, Philadelphia, \$1.25), by William A. Stretcher, B.S.G., a useful book for gymnasium directors, contains a variety of exercises for boys and girls who range between the ages of eight and twenty.

In "George Edward Woodberry" (Poetry Review Co., Cambridge, Mass.), Louis V. Ledoux studies the philosophy and the art of the bard of Beverly. The tribute paid to him by his highly eulogistic but evidently sincere admirer, is in many ways deserved. The sketch is concerned only with the poetry of Mr. Woodberry and leaves out of the question the prose writings by which he is perhaps little known. Mr. Woodberry, as his admirer admits, is a poet's poet. Perhaps he will never have a very wide appeal, but thanks to his idealism, his broad sympathy with his fellows and the spiritual note so clearly uttered in his verse he deserves a high place among our American singers.—"Growth in Silence" (Putnam, \$1.50) by Susanna Cockett, is a collection of essays with a hazy sort of social uplift for their theme and a false philosophy and theology for their foundation. An altruism that relies in a pantheistic view of life for its cogency and which must be bolstered up by a denial of hell, rejection of all dogma by fiducial faith and private interpretation of the Bible is foredoomed. Vague generalities,

inaccurate definitions and half-truths abound and they are stated with an air of finality and oracular assurance quite inconsistent in a book which relegates all dogma to the rubbish heap. Of course, some good things are said, and said well, but this is in spite of the false principles on which the essays are based.

"The Prison and the Prisoner" (Little, Brown, \$2.50) is a symposium of fourteen essays outlining the principles and spirit of modern penology. Among the contributors are noted the names of Judge Wadham, Earl Kirchwey, George Gordon Battle, Dr. Salmon and Thomas Mott Osborne; among the topics treated are the "Indeterminate Sentence," "Mutual Welfare League," "Industrial Training," "Community Centers" and "The Delinquent." The collection is announced by the editor, Julia K. Jaffray, as containing the result of seven years of study and investigation by the National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor and as constituting a broad, scientific background of fact upon which can be based in future years the training of prison workers, the reform of our institutions and the individual study of their inmates. The unstinted praise accorded the indeterminate sentence is at variance with the recent condemnation of the same made by Justice Cropsey while imposing a light sentence on a politician convicted of primary frauds. The new Sing Sing calls for a receiving station and clearing house for all New York State prisoners. Here they will undergo a probationary period of three months during which will be given medical and mental treatment and a record of their life-history, ancestry, character and aptitudes carefully drawn up. Then will follow a distribution to other institutions. Affiliation to some other university is suggested to enable prisoners to follow extension courses. In view of all the improvements planned for the new Sing Sing, the Ossining prison would appear to be a very attractive home.

"The Historical Development of Religion in China" (Dutton, \$2.00), by W. J. Clennell, has for its purpose to show the influence that various stages of Chinese history have had on the progress of religious belief in that country. The method of treatment is popular, not technical, and withal so plausible that heresy and false philosophy lurk almost unperceived. For instance, in seeking to explain the acceptance of Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism and Christianity the author must fall back on Modernism and define religion as "those universal and eternal experiences which uplift the heart." "As experience expands, institutions and doctrines must adapt themselves to these various stages of growth and knowledge." Mere human cults may have appealed to Chinamen in proportion to their power to satisfy some natural craving, but Catholicism is God-given and no evolution of man can outgrow the obligation to live up to its teachings, once they have been freely embraced. Indeed all such evolution as the author holds must be rejected for it is based on the principle that moral values are shifting and not eternally measured by God's eternal decrees. He speaks flippantly of saints and sacred things, has a horror for ritual and dogma and ceremony, and of course glorifies the Reformation. Though the author expresses admiration for the Catholic missionaries that labored for souls in China, he does not always appreciate the purity of their motives.

In the revised edition of their "Laboratory Exercises to Accompany 'First Principles of Chemistry'" (Allyn & Bacon), Messrs. Brownlee, Fuller, Hancock, Sohon and Whitsit have produced practically a new work, both in substance and form. Many fresh experiments have been added, offering a great range of material, and those that also appeared in the original manual have been remodeled and improved. The laboratory directions are well detailed, especially in the first experiments where the student has need of extra help, and a number of new drawings

and half-tones have been added. The characteristic feature of the new manual, however, appears in the helpful questions asked in each experiment. A few of the experiments seem to be beyond the range of the ordinary high-school student, but many of them are required by certain State departments of education.—“*Espana Pintoresca, the Life and Customs of Spain in Story and Legend*” (Ginn), by Carolina Marcial Dorado, deserves a hearty welcome from teachers of elementary Spanish. The editor, realizing that sympathy with the manners and customs of a people is necessary for a right understanding of a country's literature, has succeeded in presenting a faithful picture of heroic Catholic Spain, almost every phase of Spanish life and character seem to be represented. The selections in prose and verse being intended for beginners are simple and the imitation exercises and the questions based on the text should prove helpful and suggestive.

In Louise Collier Willcox's “A Manual of Mystic Verse” (Dutton, \$1.25), a new edition of an anthology which first appeared seven years ago under the title, “A Manual of Spiritual Fortification,” there are good selections from such Catholic poets as Coventry Patmore, Father Hopkins, Alice Meynell, Louise Imogen Guiney, Francis Thompson, etc. These stanzas called “The Happiest Heart,” by John Vance Cheney, are less familiar than most of the compiler's selections:

Who drives the horses of the sun  
Shall lord it but a day;  
Better the lowly deed were done,  
And kept—the humble way.

The rust shall find the sword of fame.  
The dust will hide the crown;  
Ay, none shall nail so high his name  
Time will not tear it down.

The happiest heart that ever beat  
Was in some quiet breast  
That found the common daylight sweet,  
And left to Heaven the rest.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

**Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris:**

*L'Œuvre de Paul Claudel*, Par Joseph De Tonquedec. 2 fr; *Les Témoins du Renouveau Catholique*, Par Th. Mainage. 3 fr.; *De l'Art à la Foi*, Jean Thorel, Par Albert Bessières, S.J. 1 fr. 50.

**Boni Leveright, New York:**

*The Bolsheviks and World Peace*. By Leon Trotsky. Introduction by Lincoln Steffens. \$1.50.

**Dodd, Mead & Co., New York:**

*Carolyn of the Corners*. By Ruth Belmore Endicott. With Illustrations by Edward C. Caswell. \$1.35; *A Roumanian Diary*, 1915, 1916, 1917. By Lady Kennard. With Illustrations. \$1.25.

**George H. Doran Co., New York:**

*The Dreamers and Other Poems*. By Theodosia Garrison. \$1.25.

**E. P. Dutton Co., New York:**

*Man's Supreme Inheritance*. By F. Matthias Alexander. \$2.00; *On the Threshold of the Unseen*. By Sir William F. Barrett, F.R.S. \$2.50; *Memoirs of Cardinal De Retz*. With an Introduction by David Ogg. Two Volumes. \$2.00; *The Lost Naval Papers*. By Bennet Copplestone. \$1.50.

**The Four Seas Co., Boston:**

*Nocturne of Remembered Spring and Other Poems*. By Conrad Aiken. \$1.50.

**Henry Holt & Co., New York:**

*On Contemporary Literature*. By Stuart P. Sherman. \$1.50.

**Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:**

*The Finding of Norah*. By Eugenia Brooks Frothingham. \$0.75; *The Door of Dreams*. By Jessie B. Rittenhouse. \$1.00.

**The International Catholic Truth Society, Brooklyn:**

*The Lenten Gospels* (Exclusive of Holy Week); *Meditations on the Cross and Passion*. By St. Francis de Sales; *A Simple Prayer Book*. \$0.05 each.

**J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia:**

*Religions of the Past and Present*. A Series of Lectures Delivered by Members of the Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. Edited by James A. Montgomery, Ph.D., S.T.D. \$2.50.

**Longmans, Green & Co., New York:**

*A Russian Gentleman*. By Serge Aksakoff. Translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second Impression. \$2.25.

**The Parents Association, New York:**

*Practical Child Training*: I, *Obedience*; II, *Self-Control*; III, *Body and Mind*; IV, *Morality*. By Ray C. Beery. With Development Chart. \$12.00.

**The Torch Press, New York:**

*Collected Poems*. By Charles V. H. Roberts. \$1.25.

#### SOCIOLOGY

##### American Social Legislation.

FOR a number of years our country lagged behind the rest of the civilized world in matters of social legislation. The mental attitude of our people favored a policy of extreme individualism, and saw little need of concern about the welfare of the working masses. They were complacently supposed to be in far better circumstances and to enjoy greater opportunities than their unfortunate European brethren. When unpleasant murmurs of discontent began to disillusion us and to disquiet our smug self-satisfaction, the peculiarities of our Constitution rendered futile for a while our first legislative attempts to remedy a situation whose crying evils were fast becoming obvious to even the least discerning.

As we grew to be an intensely industrial nation, industrial accidents became more numerous. They generally incapacitated the worker for some time, and often were followed by total disability or death, leaving his dependents in want. The claim agent at times settled with the latter for a small monetary consideration and a waiver. Workmen had no other means of redress except through long and costly litigation against rich and powerful employers, who were often determined to evade responsibility and the payment of compensation by all the means which the law put at their disposal. The outcome, always uncertain, was frequently disappointing. This patent and exasperating injustice became a most prolific source of discontent, the more so when set over against the ever-increasing dividends of the large corporations, responsible for the greatest number of accidents.

##### SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN GERMANY

IN Europe this same problem had become acute long before we began to realize how pregnant it is with consequences fateful in their import, unless dealt with in a spirit of justice and fair play. Having to face the mounting tide of Socialism and its strident but sometimes equitable demands, Germany was compelled very early to turn her attention to the solution of this and related questions deeply affecting the welfare of the working masses and ultimately of the whole State. In 1876 the Sickness Insurance bill received the sanction of the imperial parliament. The Accident Insurance law, passed in 1884, became operative in 1885. The Act for Insurance Against Old Age and Invalidity was approved in 1889 and completed the trio of the laws which constitute the component parts of the German social insurance system. These laws were consolidated and codified by the Insurance Consolidation Act of 1911. While at first limited in scope, they were eventually extended to all classes of workers, and made practically universal in their application. Though insurance is made compulsory by law, it would be erroneous to suppose that it is a State insurance system; for, with the exception of the old age and invalidity pensions, the Government makes no contributions to the insurance funds. Thus the Sickness Insurance bill prescribes that the employers shall contribute one-third and the employees two-thirds of the funds necessary for the support of the system.

##### SOCIAL LEGISLATION IN ENGLAND

THE adoption of the workmen's compensation principle in England and its enactment into law were very gradual and of more recent date than the German system. The latter was formulated and adopted in its entirety as a well-defined social program, in an extension of the recognized function of the State to further the welfare of all its citizens. The English Workmen's Compensation Act, on the contrary, was the forerunner of a more complete program of social insurance. Its adoption was slow because it involved the repudiation of the individualistic principles which had long been dear to the ruling British theoretical economists of the Manchester school. It was brought into being gradually as the result of constant agitation

against various specific evils of which the workman was the frequent and helpless victim.

The first Workmen's Compensation Act in England was passed in 1897. It applied only to undertakings that might be classified as hazardous. But it was amended in 1900 and again in 1906 so as to make its application practically universal, covering all occupations. This law was the cornerstone of the English social insurance system. There were added an old age pension scheme adopted in 1908 and extended in 1909; a system of sickness insurance through the National Insurance Act of 1911, and an experimental scheme of insurance against unemployment limited in its scope to the building and engineering trades, also established by the National Insurance Act. State paternalism was developed on a larger scale than in Germany. Thus the old age pension scheme is supported wholly by the Government. So is the system of unemployment insurance. The sickness insurance system is supported by contributions from the employer, the employee and the State. The German system was for a number of years the subject of sharp criticism in England, and hence the country's thorough conversion to the principle of social insurance, largely through the efforts of Lloyd George, is all the more significant.

#### BEGINNINGS OF AMERICAN LABOR LEGISLATION

**W**ITH the more complete industrial development of the United States and the endless litigation resulting from accidental injuries, an agitation for the enactment of laws similar to those of Germany and England, but suited to American conditions, was gradually brought about. No determined program was followed. The first steps toward the adoption of the workmen's compensation principle were taken by the enactment of many laws to ameliorate labor conditions. Such were the laws relating to the hours of labor; the laws relating to safety and health in industry, in transportation by land or water, in mining and other underground work; and still other laws relating to the employment of women and children. The number of these laws became truly bewildering, and may be appreciated by the statement that the labor laws in force at the end of 1913, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, Washington, fill two volumes of nearly 2,500 printed pages.

The State labor departments, acting through factory inspectors, were charged with the duty of enforcing these laws. But their very number and variety precluded adequate enforcement. Moreover the inspectors in many cases were political appointees, without due qualifications for their work, which consequently was done in a perfunctory manner. The laws on the statute books made for better conditions. Accidents, however, kept increasing in frequency and severity, because the administration of the law and the enforcement of rights remained subject to the older forms of procedure necessitating litigation in many cases where the employer refused to recognize his liability towards an employee.

#### LEGISLATIVE DIFFICULTIES

**I**T became increasingly clear that any amendment of the common law, however well-intentioned, would fall short of the needs to be met. The problem could be solved only by a system under which industry would be compelled to compensate for the injuries which it caused, thus eliminating all uncertainty as to the amount an injured employee was entitled to receive, as well as all delay in enforcing through the courts the right to compensation. Two difficulties were to be overcome. Labor legislation of necessity favors a certain class as against other classes, and the cry of unconstitutional "class legislation" would not down. Moreover, labor legislation should be national in its scope in justice to the employer as well as to the employee. But our Constitution provides that the Federal Government possesses only those powers which have been specifically delegated to it by the several States. The States, however, have

retained control of practically all matters of domestic concern such as the regulation of industry. Besides it was contended with good reason that the passing of stringent liability laws, such as those contemplated by the English Employers' Liability Act, would work greatly to the disadvantage of the manufacturers in those States which adopted them, if other States refused to enact them. The added outlay of providing for industrial accidents must necessarily mean an increased cost of manufacture, thus making the cost of the finished product higher to the manufacturers in those States which had strict liability laws than in the States having no such laws. This inconvenience was serious enough; yet it was a minor objection when compared with the constitutional difficulty. It was generally felt that if the latter could be overcome, the road would soon be cleared of all other obstacles.

#### ELECTIVE COMPENSATION

**W**HILE attempts at compensation laws, for the most part ineffective because of the constitutional handicap, were being made in various states—Maryland, Massachusetts, Illinois, Montana, New York—a principle was found on which to base laws that would stand the test of constitutionality: it was the principle of elective or optional compensation, leaving both employers and employees free in their acceptance of the provisions of the law.

If an employer does not elect to pay compensation according to the terms of the law, the defenses of assumption of risk, contributory negligence and the fellow-servant defense are removed and are not available in bar of any claim which an employee may bring against him for an occupational injury. If in turn an employee rejects the benefits of the law after an employer has accepted it, the employer has the right to establish any of the common law defenses in bar of a claim which may be made by the employee for injuries received during the course of his employment.—(J. E. Rhodes.)

This was to some extent a piece of legislative trickery where compulsion is disguised under an appearance of voluntary insurance, but it was recognized as a practical and feasible method of relief, and it passed the test of constitutionality in the Supreme Court of the United States in March, 1917.

#### OUR PRESENT STATUS

**C**OMPENSATION laws began to be put on the statute books in 1911, and are now in force in two-thirds of the States of the Union, while Congress has passed a law establishing a compensation system for Government employees. As our system now stands, it is an adoption of the English and German systems. Its form and substantial provisions are based on the English law, whilst those provisions that make insurance compulsory and provide special administrative machinery are adapted from the German system.

As this brief survey shows, we have come to realize that we have a social question to solve, and we have made noticeable progress towards its solution. However, we are still far from the more comprehensive systems of England and Germany, providing old age pensions, sickness insurance and insurance against unemployment. But the principle of the State's responsibility towards the workers now being firmly established, there is little doubt that the force of circumstances and continued agitation will also bring these eminently just measures into being. The Government has entered the life insurance field for the benefit of our soldiers and sailors. By executive enactments of almost revolutionary extent it has reached deep into the fabric of the social body. It is safe to say that the intense individualism of pre-war times has gone never to return. While we have not lived up to our reputation of being in the vanguard of progress where matters of social justice were concerned, we are on the eve of great changes, that promise to put us on an equal footing with the best European legislation in the field of social endeavor.

J. B. CULEMANS.

## EDUCATION

## Crass Evolution in the School

MOST naturalists have by this time abandoned the Darwinian theory in its exclusive form. More than twenty years ago, Dr. Hans Driesch arraigned Darwinism in the rather plain words: "It is a matter of history, like that other curiosity of our century, Hegel's philosophy. Both are variations on the theme, 'How to take in a whole generation,' and neither is very likely to give ages to come a high opinion of the latter part of our century." Six years later, in 1902, the same eminent zoologist said: "For men of clear intellect, Darwinism has long been dead, and the last argument brought forward in support of it (by L. Plate) is scarcely more than a funeral oration in accordance with the principle *De mortuis nihil nisi bonum*, and with an underlying conviction of the real weakness of the subject chosen for defense."

## EVOLUTIONARY HUMANISM

NEVERTHELESS this antiquated vagary is still worshiped as a fetish in some educational circles where the enlightened educators make it "function" in educational theory and method. An instance in point is an article entitled "Evolutionary Humanism in Education," printed in recent issues of the *American Schoolmaster*, a magazine devoted to the professional aspects of teaching, and published by the Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. The author of the article is Dr. Orland O. Norris, Assistant Professor of Latin in that institution. Frankly, and plainly, and most insistently this writer advocates a new ideal in education which must be translated, first of all, into the elementary school, and it is the evolutionary ideal. The article embodies one of the crassest pleas for "crude evolution" ever made. Mr. Norris appeals to the small voice of "the species consciousness within him" (man) and holds that "any view that does not take into account, the doctrine and the process of evolution is a miserably foreshortened one, wholly lacking the perspective afforded by modern science."

For the greater portion of this incomprehensively long progression, man has been directed over his hazardous course by gross sense and instinct, being for long non-existent as the differentiated species that we know as man. An average of the guesses made by those best qualified for such guessing, would make the age of man as a distinct species 500,000 years, his entire age as a mammal 5,000,000 years, and the gross extent of organic history 100,000,000 years. Increased evidence and study tend to increase rather than diminish these figures. The real humanism . . . may be made to function in the underlying struggle of the species after biological immortality.

No other quotations are necessary to prove that Mr. Norris offers a real plea for crass and unscientific evolution. In fact, he not only out-Darwins Darwin, but almost succeeds in out-Haeckeling Haeckel.

## TERMS NOT IDEAS

THE favorite expressions "species ideal," "species continuity," "species consciousness," "racial immortality," "biological immortality of the race," are repeated as if repetition might be counted on to stand for proof. In one sentence on page 249, these expressions occur four times. To leave no doubt about his final aim, the writer says distinctly, "My purpose is definitely to bring the evolutionary doctrine within the domain of educational philosophy and to declare, in view of its manifest meaning for us, that any subject to justify a position in our public school curriculum must make a claim to tangible species value." It is extremely difficult to find in Mr. Norris' treatise any explanation as to how this species value is "tangible." It is readily granted that there is this much of truth in the species value, namely, that every human being is a member of the human family, that every individual should be interested, not

only in his family, his State, his nation, but in the human family at large. We should have an interest in, and love for all members of the human family, because all are children of God. This interest is not abstract and impersonal, but must extend to the individual, and in the first place to those who are near to us. But the individual has his own individual and specific value, that is, expressed in Christian terms, every human being has his own immortal soul to save. It may be fairly questioned whether this "species value" would induce anyone to make a sacrifice of property or life for our country. Men do not die for a biological phrase.

In arguing his case, Mr. Norris stops not even at allusions to quotations from Scripture. The attempt reminds one of Shakespeare's line that the devil can quote Scripture to suit his purpose. A mere fling is ever a poor argument, and certainly Mr. Norris' sneer at the narration in Scripture of our first parents does not make a "myth" of a stubborn and undeniable fact.

## EDUCATIONAL JARGON

IT is something of a mystery how this crude and incorrect article found its way into the pages of the *American Schoolmaster*, an exponent, usually of sound views in education. It is refreshing, for instance, to read Mr. John E. Winter's paper, "The Moral Ideal in Education," an article highly creditable both to the writer and to the magazine. Further, whilst Flexner's "Modern School" is heartily indorsed by Mr. Norris, this indorsement is not shared by the *American Schoolmaster*, as is evident from the note on the Princeton Classical Conference.

It may be irony, and it may be fate that the September issue of the *American Schoolmaster* contains an excellent paper, "Educational Jargon," in which E. A. Strong offers a severe criticism of the unintelligible pedagogical language affected by so many modern writers. As an instance he quotes a lecturer, who to inform his audience that "children like play" could do no better than to repeat as many as five times the formula, "Play functions largely as a factor in the psychology of the child." A lecturer on pedagogy used the expression "group motivation" twenty-two times during a single discourse. It would be interesting to know, but tiresome to ascertain, how many times Mr. Morris uses the expression "species value" in his paper. As a sample of pedagogical language the following may serve: "A proper motivation of life and its activities from infancy must certainly result in great conservation of energy through properly integrated and spontaneously controlled conduct, and also in more certain, dynamic effort" (p. 245).

It is confidently hoped that the unscientific and harmful statements set forth in the paper under stricture are not taken seriously by the readers of the *American Schoolmaster*. For these vague and incorrect ideas are subversive both of American and Christian aims in education.

F. HEIERMANN, S.J.

## NOTE AND COMMENT

## The Censor's Perplexity

LAST November, reports the *Chicago Tribune*, the friends of a former student of St. Louis University, who is now a lieutenant in France, cabled to him the result of the Thanksgiving football game in the words: "St. Louis, 13; Washington, 0." For days and days the French censor, puzzled over the cryptic message which seemed on its face to be both un-American and anti-French, for the great St. Louis had after his name the ill-omened number 13, and the immortal Washington actually appeared to be appraised at zero. Could it be that some German spy was scornfully using such honored names to cover a treasonable code-message to his confederate in France? Of that the censor could not satisfy himself for a long time. After nearly a

month's delay, however, the cablegram was delivered. Our soldiers "over there" should teach our French Allies the mysteries of score keeping.

#### War Resolutions of Catholic Alumnae

THE latest bulletin of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae contains the following war resolutions adopted at the executive meeting and reflecting the loyalty and devotion of our Catholic alumnae to their country's cause:

Therefore, resolved, That this organization reiterate the pledge of 50,000 federated women in every State in the Union, in the provinces of Canada and as far north as Alaska, and offer its service whenever and wherever the Government calls. It urges cooperation in food conservation, purchase of Liberty Bonds, Red Cross work, relief work for soldiers both in Canada and the United States, the education of child victims of the war, support of moral zones surrounding the army cantonments and systematic aid in providing proper homes for girls flocking into cities to succeed to the work of soldiers. This work will be facilitated by cooperation with the women's committee of the Council of National Defense, the National Catholic War Council and the Knights of Columbus.

Catholic women are bearing a proportionate share in the heroic sacrifices which this war exacts from the nation.

#### Report of New York Children's Court

WAR conditions are reacting disastrously upon American children. The increase in juvenile delinquency noted in European countries is already manifesting itself in a pronounced way in the United States. The annual report of the children's court of New York City shows that 14,519 children came before the court last year. This truly terrifying number represents an increase of 2,094 over the previous year. It is stated that such cases multiplied most perceptibly toward the end of 1917. The immediate causes assigned are the scarcity of food and fuel, and the difficulty of making proper provision for some of these children. It is obvious that both economic and religious remedies must be applied to stay this avalanche.

#### How He Came Back

THE little incident narrated below, as told by a Knights of Columbus field secretary, admirably illustrates the good accomplished in our camps by the Knights:

He was rather an attractive boy, weak-willed perhaps, a little overindulgent, but he was subject to good influences just as he had been to bad. He came to the building first to write a letter, and then he became interested in a basket-ball game which was being organized. He made few friends, but for several evenings during the week he came, not participating to any great extent in the activities, but looking on with the attitude of one who felt he was not entirely entitled to participate in the joys of others.

I stood near him and we conversed about the ordinary things of camp life. Naturally, I did not ask him whether he was a Catholic, but the next morning, Sunday, I saw him in the rear of the building during the celebration of Mass. He had neither beads nor a prayer-book, although he stood and knelt with the rest of the men. That evening he came to the building again and asked me if I could give him a prayer-book. This I did, and he seemed greatly pleased. The next night he came to me and told me that he wanted to come back. I misunderstood him, and asked whether he wanted to go back home. "No," he replied, "I want to come back to the Church. You see I should be a Catholic, but my mother died when I was young, and I have not paid much attention to religion. But I'm a Catholic all right, and when I see these other fellows at Mass and Communion, I want to be a real Catholic. Tell me how to go about it." I called the chaplain and they had a conference. The next

morning he assisted at the chaplain's Mass and received Holy Communion.

The field secretary who tells this story declares that dozens of similar instances came under his own observation.

#### Amos Pinchot and the Protestant Churches

ASKED to express his opinion of the help to be expected from religion after the war, Amos Pinchot made the following reflections upon the Protestant churches:

From religion as expressed in our churches, I fear we cannot expect very much. I am familiar with Protestant churches only, but I have seen very few of these that do not preach a Christianity that is worldly, essentially un-Christian in its philosophy, and generally used as a kind of offset or apology for the anti-social activities of the congregation. Of course, we cannot blame the clergy for this. Our churches are unfortunately maintained by our rich people, and it is as natural that the pastor of a church supported by privilege should be anti-Christian and the buttress of privilege, as it is that the editor of a newspaper owned by members of the privileged class should be anti-democratic and the protector of that class. The only chance that I can see of having Christian churches is to have people's churches, supported by the people themselves, or by individuals who represent in their own lives the aspirations of real Christianity.

Should the good fortune, or rather the Divine grace, of a close and thorough acquaintance with the Catholic Church, of which he admits his ignorance, be accorded to Amos Pinchot, he will not be obliged to seek further for a Church that is truly the people's Church, supported by their hard-earned daily wages, and whose just pride it is, today as ever, that by it the poor have the Gospel preached to them.

#### Limits to Academic Freedom

THAT limits should be set to "academic freedom" is one of the lessons that our secular universities have learned from the war. Thus in a joint report to the trustees of Columbia University, made by the Committee on Education and the Special Committee on the State of Teaching, the principle is laid down that the relation of confidence between an officer and the university necessarily terminates "when the conduct or utterances of any academic officer, either within or without the university, imperil its influence or reputation or are inconsistent with his implied pledge in accepting appointment." The Joint Committee furthermore concurs with the opinion expressed in President Butler's annual report for 1910, that freedom implies responsibility, and that academic freedom is naturally subject to "the limitations imposed by common morality, common sense, common loyalty and a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." It may be stated without fear of contradiction that all these conditions have in the past been freely violated in our secular universities. There is little hope that morality and religion will not continue to be outraged in these seats of learning where rationalism and atheism sit entrenched, and where, consequently, common sense and historic veracity are equally ignored when Christianity, and in particular the Catholic Church, enter into question. Though open disloyalty to the flag was certainly no greater evil than the attacks upon religion, and only a natural consequence following upon them, yet in the present crisis of the nation such disloyalty could not fail to bring home the truth of the principle, acknowledged in theory at least, by the Joint Committee, that limits must be set to academic freedom. It is not to be imagined, however, that hereafter, any more than before, secular universities will become a fit place for the education of sons and daughters whose parents are concerned for the spiritual welfare of the souls entrusted to their care.